

THURSTON COUNTY
Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment for
CHAPTER 6, CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN



Thurston County Board of County Commissioners
Adopted December 20, 2004

Thurston County Courthouse, Building 1, Room 280

CHAPTER SIX -- CAPITAL FACILITIES

I. Introduction

The Capital Facilities Plan is a six-year plan of capital projects for 2005-2010, with estimated dates and costs, and proposed methods of financing. The Plan is reviewed and updated annually.

Capital facilities are the facilities needed to support growth. They include roads, bridges, sewers, parks and open spaces, and facilities for drinking water, stormwater, garbage disposal and recycling, and all the government buildings, which house public services.

By the year 2025, the population of Thurston County is projected to grow to 334,260. This is an increase of 123,350 or 58% from the 2000 population of 210,910. Within the next six years, the population is expected to grow by 12-15%. Along with homes and workplaces, all of the new residents will need public facilities such as roads, schools, parks, and sewers.

The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is one of the sections of the Comprehensive Plan that is required by the State Growth Management Act. The Growth Management Act requires the CFP to identify specific facilities, include a realistic financing plan, and make adjustments to the plan if funding is inadequate. Capital facilities are important because they support the growth envisioned in the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Planning for capital facilities is a complex task carried out by each department of the County. It requires an understanding of future needs, assessing various types of capital facilities that could be provided, identifying the most effective and efficient facilities to support the needed service, and lastly addressing how these facilities will be financed. Therefore, this Plan is actually the product of separate but coordinated planning efforts, each focusing on a specific type of facilities.

Financial planning and implementation of capital facilities cannot be effectively carried out on an annual basis, since financing often requires multi-year commitments of financial resources. Therefore, this plan is long-range in scope. The CFP assumes receipt of outside grant resources, and if grants are not received, projects may be delayed or removed. The CFP is a planning document; not a budget for expenditures, nor a guarantee that the projects will be implemented. Each capital project listed in the CFP will need to go through a separate approval process.

The capital facilities in this plan are those owned or managed by Thurston County. Capital facilities provided by cities, including the extension of water and sewer systems to unincorporated urban growth areas adjacent

to the cities, are found in city joint plans. The portions of joint plans that apply to unincorporated urban growth areas are adopted by both the applicable city and Thurston County. Facilities provided by school districts and other local governmental entities are referred to in Section VI of this CFP.

The CFP includes Goals, Objectives, and Policies to guide the development of capital facilities and implement the requirements of the Growth Management Act. General Goals, Objectives and Policies that apply to all capital facility planning are listed below. Additional goals, objectives, and policies are listed within the appropriate sections of this plan. (However, additional goals and policies related to transportation capital facilities can be found in the Transportation Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan.)

GENERAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

GOAL 1: AS THE COUNTY GROWS, PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES SHOULD BE PROVIDED AT REASONABLE COSTS, IN PLACES AND AT LEVELS COMMENSURATE WITH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND BUILT TO BE ADEQUATE TO SERVE DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT DECREASING CURRENT SERVICE LEVELS BELOW LOCALLY ESTABLISHED MINIMUM STANDARDS.

OBJECTIVE 1-A: *Public Involvement in Planning* - Public involvement will be provided in all phases of public facilities planning.

POLICIES:

1. The public will be notified of and given opportunities to participate in the drafting and final adoption of:
 - a. Standards for public facilities (such as road standards).
 - b. Capital improvement plans and funding methods (e.g., Boston Harbor or Grand Mound Sewerage Planning, and six year Capital Facilities Plans).
 - c. The identification of levels of service standards or other determinants of need for public capital facilities, and establishment of new public facility management programs (e.g., stormwater).
2. All county departments should notify the public of the development of new plans, programs and regulations.

OBJECTIVE 1-B: *Environmental Impacts* - When designing and locating public facilities, procedures will be followed to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the environment and other public facilities.

POLICIES:

1. Impacts on critical areas, natural resource lands, and transportation systems should be considered and adverse impacts avoided or mitigated.
2. Public facilities should be sited with the least disruption critical areas and natural resource lands.

OBJECTIVE 1-C: *Paying for Capital Facilities* - Ensure that costs of county-owned capital facilities are within the county's funding capacity, and equitably distributed between users and the county in general.

POLICIES:

1. Use the Capital Facilities Plan to integrate all of the county's capital project resources (grants, bonds, general county funds, donations, real estate excise tax, conservation futures levy, fees and rates for public utility services, and any other available funding).
2. Assess the additional operations and maintenance costs associated with the acquisition or development of new capital facilities. If accommodating these costs places an unacceptable burden on the operating budget, capital plans may need to be adjusted.
3. Promote efficient and joint use of facilities with neighboring governments and private citizens through such measures as interlocal agreements and negotiated use of privately and publicly owned lands or facilities (such as open space, stormwater facilities or government buildings).
4. Explore regional funding strategies for capital facilities to support comprehensive plans developed under the Growth Management Act.
5. Agreements should be developed between the County and cities for transferring the financing of capital facilities in the Urban Growth Areas to the cities when they annex the contributing lands.
6. Users pay for public utility services, except when it is clearly in the public interest not to do so.
7. Provide public utility services at the lowest possible cost, but take into account both construction and operation/maintenance costs.

8. Correctly time and size public utility services to provide adequate growth capacity and to avoid expensive remedial action.
9. If the County is faced with capital facility funding shortfalls, use any combination of the following strategies to balance revenues and needs for public facilities required to serve existing and future development:
 - a. Increase Revenues
 - Bonds.
 - New or increased user fees or rates.
 - New or increased taxes.
 - Regional cost sharing.
 - Developer voluntarily funds needed capital project.
 - b. Decrease Level of Service Standards
 - Change Level of Service Standards, if consistent with Growth Management Act Goals.
 - c. Reprioritize Projects to Focus on Those Related to Concurrency
 - d. Decrease the Cost of the Facility
 - Change project scope.
 - Find less expensive alternatives.
 - e. Decrease the Demand for the Public Service or Facility
 - Institute measures to conserve or cut use of the facility, such as ride-sharing programs to cut down on traffic demands on roadways.
 - Institute measures to slow or direct population growth or development, such as, moratoria on development, developing only in areas served by facilities with available capacity until funding is available for other areas, changing project timing and/or phasing.
 - f. Revise the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Chapter
 - Change types or intensities of land use as needed to balance with the amount of capital facilities that can be provided to support development.

OBJECTIVE 1-D: *Coordination with Growth* - Public utility service plans should be prepared and facilities constructed to support planned growth.

POLICIES:

1. Land use decisions as identified in the Comprehensive Plan and Joint Plans should be the determinants of development intensity rather than public utility decisions and public utility planning.
2. Where land use plans and zoning designate urban levels of land uses and subsequently adopted long-range plans for public utilities show that urban levels of utilities are not feasible, the plan and zoning designations should be reviewed.
3. Extension of services and construction of public capital facilities should be provided at levels consistent with development intensity identified in this Comprehensive Plan, sub-area plans still in effect, and joint plans.
4. Public utility services within growth areas should be phased outward from the urbanizing core as that core becomes substantially developed, in order to concentrate urban growth and infilling.
5. New users of capital facilities should not reduce service levels for current users.
6. The County should coordinate capital facilities planning with cities and towns and identify shared needs for public purpose lands.

OBJECTIVE 1-E: *Coordination with Budget and Related Documents* - The County's capital budget and six year transportation program will be consistent with the Capital Facilities Plan.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County's annual capital budget and six year transportation program required under RCW 36.81.121 will be fully consistent with the intent and substance of this Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan.
2. The year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Comprehensive Plan due to:
 - a. Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the county with conditions about when they may be used, or
 - b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve new development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.

3. Specific debt financing proposals may vary from that shown in the Comprehensive Plan due to changes in interest rates, other terms of financing, or other conditions which make the proposals in the plan not advantageous financially.
4. The addition of an entirely new facility, not anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan, will require formal amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The transportation projects in the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan will be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

II. Level of Service Standards:

Level of Service Standards are quantifiable measures of the amount of public facility that is provided, such as acres of park land per capita, sanitary sewers capacity to meet users being served, or solid waste in tons disposed or percent diverted by recycling. Minimum standards are established at the local level. Factors that influence local standards are recommendations from citizens, County Commissioners, and the Planning Commission; also national, federal, and state standards and mandates.

This Capital Facilities Plan will enable Thurston County to accommodate 15 percent growth during the next six years (over 31,500 new people) while maintaining the levels of service standards in this table's column labeled "CFP LOS." In its last two columns, this table also shows how this standard compares to existing level of service 2001 or 2002 and previously adopted standards:

Table 6-1
Level of Service Standards and Comparison to Previous CFP

Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2005-2010)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
County Buildings:				
Coroner	Gross Sq. Ft. (GSF) "x" GSF for up to 200 autopsies per year (& medical exam. system)	1994 Space Planning Report: 6,656	6,950 (gross SF) (2003)	Same as 2004 - 2009 CFP.
Courts--District	GSF per courtroom unit (<i>Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. & Jury Rms.</i>)	1994 Space Plng. Report: 3320/jury ctrm. unit; 2346/non-jury unit 2000: 3 Ctrms.; 3 judicial positions 2014: 4 Ctrms.; 3.5 judicial positions.	Net SF: 2284/jury ctrm. unit 1178/non-jury unit 4 ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Courts--Superior	GSF per courtroom unit (<i>Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. & Jury Rms.</i>)	1994 Space Plng. Report: 4502/stand. jury unit 5606/large jury unit 2622/non-jury unit 2000: 9 Ctrms.; 8.88 judicial positions 2014: 12 Ctrms. 13 judicial positions.	Net SF: 3346/jury ctrm. unit 1390/non jury unit ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Courts--Juvenile & Family	GSF per courtroom unit (<i>Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. Rms.</i>)	1994 Space Plng. Report: 2622/non jury courtroom unit (GSF) (1938 NSF [net sq. ft.] for non-jury courtroom unit)	1940 net SF at new Juve bldg. 4 ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2005-2010)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009))
Detention—Juvenile	Beds for target years <i>(based on arrest-sentencing trend for juvenile population)</i>	1994 Space Plng. Report: 99 beds for 2005 112 beds for 2014 <i>(not counting beds for outside contracts)</i> 20-40 in day detention	2000: 60 beds av. daily; 78 av. high; 24 av. Low; 80 bed capacity. 2000 Day Detention: 20 av. daily	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Jail—Adult (incl. Satellite)	Beds/inmates for target years <i>(based on peak population forecasts by Regional Jail Advisory Committee [RJAC] 8/28/96)</i>	2005: 530 beds/487inmates 2015: 515 beds/653 inmates (RJAC 8/96)	2000: 361 av. daily 358 beds operational capacity.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
All Co. Gov't. Administration	"x" GSF per FTE employee	219 GSF—for new construction. For existing facilities & rental space: meet the new construction standards to the extent possible.	202 (1994)	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP without the proposed new addition.
GSF = Gross Square Feet <i>(includes internal office and external building circulation [hallways, stairwells and elevator shafts], mechanical, public restrooms, etc.)</i> NSF = Net Square Feet <i>(does not include the above items)</i>				
Parks & Trails	LOS 1: Develop all or part of previously acquired property, or complete development projects that are underway, focusing on those that fill deficiencies in priorities defined by the public, i.e., trails, water access, athletic facilities. Main emphasis is on development of existing undeveloped park properties. LOS 2: Acquire additional park lands to insure that a 4.5 acre/1,000 population of developed park and recreation facilities LOS can be maintained through 2020.	LOS 1: Development (by 2010): An additional 588 acres will be developed to provide additional water access, athletic facilities & 7 additional miles of existing trails--to bring trails to a total of 28 miles of developed trails out of an inventory of 42.5 miles. The County continues to look for additional revenue sources to develop existing park sites. LOS 2: Acquisition: Acquire opportunity properties to insure an adequate land base in the future for maintaining the 4.5 acres/1,000 population LOS. Currently, the inventory of undeveloped land is adequate to meet this LOS 2010.	5 of 25 park sites and 23 miles of 42.5 miles of trails have been developed (as of 2004). Acquired: 2,773 acres have been acquired (as of 2004)	2004-2009 CFP: Developed by 2008 —an add'l. 1,125 acres of water access & athletic facilities and 7.0 add'l miles of trails to a total of 28 miles developed trails out of an inventory of 42.5 miles owned. 2008: acquire 1040 acres to a total of 3813 acres 2008.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2005-2010)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009))
Roads	Letter designations based on motorist delays & traffic flow (<i>A=no delays to F=delays of over one minute</i>) Table 5-1 (p. 5-8) in Chapter 5 of the Comp. Plan describes the letter system.	Urban: <i>Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater UGAs--D (E for high density residential corridors)</i> <i>Yelm UGA--C resid. zones; D commercial & Lt. Indus. zones; F urban core</i> <i>Tenino & Rainier UGAs—D Grand Mnd. UGA--D</i> Rural: C For exceptions: see p. 6-34	Urban: Varies: A - E Rural: Varies: A - D	Same as 2004-2009 CFP.
Sanitary Sewer Rural: Boston Harbor, Tamoshan, Olympic View; Urban: Grand Mound	Rural Systems: <i>Capacity to meet users being served...in terms of gallons per day residential equivalent</i> Urban Systems: <i>Capacity to meet users being served...in terms of gallons per day for residential, commercial and industrial uses</i>	Capacity varies by system (See Inventory, Table 6-12 for capacity of each system)	Capacity varies by system (See Table 6-12)	.Standard only relates to LOS for roadway capacity – for overall roadway needs/priorities see CFP Supplement.
Also, meet state/federal discharge permit requirements for receiving water standards.				
Water Systems Rural: Boston Harbor and Tamoshan; Urban: Grand Mound	Rural Systems: <i>Capacity to meet users being served...in terms of gallons per day residential equivalent</i> Urban Systems: <i>Capacity to meet users being served...in terms of gallons per day for residential, commercial and industrial uses and fire flow.</i>	Capacity varies by system (See Inventory Table 6-12 for capacity of each system)	Capacity varies by system (See Table 6-12)	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP
		Also, meet current state/federal drinking water standards		
Solid Waste	Capacity to meet waste generated by users:			
	Disposed --tons per yr.	By 20010 - 231,000 tons	174,000(03)	Same as 2004-2009 CFP
	Diverted (reduced or recycled) --% of waste generated	By 20010 – 50%	37% (03)	Same as 2004-2009 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2005-2010)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009))
Stormwater	LOS A - Includes all 3 service level units (flood control, water quality, & habitat). LOS B - Includes a combination of any two. LOS C - Includes a single service level unit.			
	Local Flood Control Facilities: Capacity to hold runoff from an "x" year storm event	Facilities for new growth: Meet 25 yr. event for public street conveyance and 100 yr. event for property protection. Facilities to improve existing deficiencies: Meet the new growth standard wherever possible.	New facilities: At the standards. Pre-existing facilities: Varies	Same as 2004-2009 CFP.
	Water Quality: Meet state/federal water quality standards in streams, rivers, lakes, and Puget Sound	New Development: Meet 2-year release rate to minimize erosion and maintain water quality standards. Stormwater Utility Facilities: Meet the new growth standards wherever possible.	Varies: See 303D list, County Water Resources Profile, and Monitoring Reports	Same as 2004-2009 CFP.
Stormwater	Habitat: Maintain or restore in-stream flows, reduce peaks, minimize bank full flow durations, improve water quality to address habitat related issues (e.g. salmonid, shellfish, etc)	In-stream Flow Goals at Basin Buildout Conditions Peak Flows: Maintain, or where possible, reduce durations. Bankfull Flows: Maintain or where possible, reduce durations. Base Flows: Maintain, or where possible, increase.	In- stream flows: Site development proposals may not exceed 2 year pre-developed release rate per Regional Drainage Manual. Passage Barriers: Two completed to date; One in design phase.	Same as 2004-2009 CFP.

Table 6-2

Level of Service Change from Existing Standards
Comparison of this Plan's standards for Level of Service
To the existing actual service level

The existing actual service levels for these facilities are THE SAME as the plan's adopted standards:

- Sewer, Water, Solid Waste, including the new Grand Mound systems
- Rural Roads
- Stormwater new development
- New Coroner Facility, New Juvenile Detention & Family Court Building, Emergency Management Center, Public Health Building, and Evaluation and Treatment Center.
- Parks Acquisition

The existing actual service levels for these facilities are BELOW the plan's adopted standards:

- Some Urban Roads
- County buildings (except for the new ones noted above)
- Stormwater CFP projects
- Parks Development

The existing actual service levels for these facilities are HIGHER than the plan's adopted standards:

- Some Urban Roads

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

III Effect on Local Taxes and Fees:

Table 6-3
Effect on Local Taxes and Fees

[Resolutions No.13072 (12/15/03)]

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
County Buildings	<p>REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX for current major maintenance and repair costs. This is a tax of ½ of 1% paid by sellers upon the sale of real property in the unincorporated county.</p> <p>SALES TAX - 1/10 of a cent. The voters approved this tax in September 1995 for construction, maintenance and operation of a juvenile detention facility and adult jail.</p> <p>PROPERTY TAX BOND LEVY in the future for Law & Justice Center - \$80,621,200</p>	<p>No change in the real estate excise tax.</p> <p>No change in the Sales tax.</p> <p>If the voters approve an \$80,621,200 bond for a Law & Justice Center, the cost to voters for the annual debt service payments on a 20 year bond would be approx. \$97.50 per year on a \$150,000 home (@ \$0.65 per \$1,000 of assessed value). This based on the current year's assessed valuations within the county.</p>
County Parks	<p>REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX for some current park development and major maintenance costs.</p> <p>CONSERVATION FUTURES PROPERTY TAX LEVY for some current park and open space acquisition costs. This is a county-wide assessment outside the both the 106% & Implicit Price Deflator (Ref. 47) lids.</p>	<p>No change in either the REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX or the CONSERVATION FUTURES property tax levy.</p>
Roads Construction (and Major Maintenance and Repair)	FOREST REVENUES	<p>NOTE: Revenues the county receives from the gas tax and the property tax road levy are used for road maintenance, not construction. Forest revenues that are deposited in the Road Fund and grants are the primary funding sources for road construction.</p>

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
Sewer and Water	<p>REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX and</p> <p>UTILITY ASSESSMENTS to users of the systems</p> <p>Grand Mound ULID</p> <p>Tamoshan and Beverly Beach ULID</p>	<p>No change in the excise tax or current utility LID assessments, except for future new utility LID assessments where new work is done on water or sewer systems and a utility local improvement district is formed to pay the costs of the improvements.</p> <p>Grand Mound: The assessments for the Grand Mound ULID range from \$3,200 for 0.7 acre to \$277,600 for 7 acres. Assessments are based on zoning and location. This is a one-time assessment that may be paid off over time.</p> <p>Tamoshan and Beverly Beach assessments will be determined closer to the time of actual improvements are constructed and a ULID is formed. Expect update in October 2004.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling Facilities	<p>TIPPING FEES (landfill disposal fee): \$67.79 per ton, plus \$3.07 per trip transaction fee- <i>(This fee took effect 1/1/04).</i></p>	<p>Tipping Fee increase is reviewed every 4 years to cover a 20-year period (to 2023). In 2003 the Board of County Commissioners elected to implement rate increases on an annual basis. Next projected increase – 2005 --to an estimated rate of \$69.50 per ton for all types of garbage, plus a \$3.10 per trip fee, representing an increase of \$4.70 per ton.</p>
Stormwater	<p>STORMWATER UTILITY RATES —(including both the base rate and the capital rate)</p> <p>For residents within the current Storm and Surface Water Utility boundaries:</p> <p>Average rural residential rate = \$23/yr. Average urban rate = \$38/yr. (includes both the base rate and a new capital rate effective in 1999).</p> <p>There are exemptions and reductions available for senior citizens, residents of lake management and drainage districts, wetlands, tidelands, lands underwater, and lands enrolled under the “Open Space” designation, plus other rates for multifamily residential, commercial, public roads, and agricultural and vacant property.</p>	<p>No change in the Storm and Surface Water Utility (SSWU) Capital Facility Plan (CFP) rate, as established by BoCC Ordinance 12829.</p>

IV. SUMMARY OF SIX-YEAR FINANCING PLAN

Table 6-4

**SUMMARY OF 2005 – 2010 CAPITAL COSTS
For Projects Owned or Managed by Thurston County
(From Tables 6-6 through 6-11)**

Project Category	2005 - 2010 Expenditure Total
------------------	----------------------------------

CAPITAL

Parks and Trails	\$ 28,634,000
Solid Waste	\$ 8,792,553
Stormwater	\$ 5,928,652
Water and Sewer	\$ 3,050,280
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	\$ 54,876,000
County Buildings	\$ 45,868,075
Capital Total	<hr/> \$ 147,149,560

DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS

Parks and Trails	\$ 6,696,169
Solid Waste	0
Stormwater	0
Water and Sewer	\$ 9,586,775
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	\$1,486,000
County Buildings	\$ 34,156,461
Debt Service Total	<hr/> \$ 51,925,405

(Resolution, No. 13072 (12/15/03))

Table 6-5
SUMMARY SIX YEAR FINANCING PLAN
2005 - 2010

BLACKED OUT AREAS = Capital categories in which the revenue source is NOT APPLICABLE

Revenue Sources	Six Year Totals						Totals by Rev. Source
	Parks	Solid Waste	Stormwater	Sewer & Water	Transportation	Buildings	
Existing Revenues - Earmarked (May be used only for specific types of facilities)							
Property Tax - Cons. Futures (Cash)	384000		\$298,900				\$682,900
Forest revenues (&reserves) to Rd. Fund for Capital					\$40,608,240		\$40,608,240
Utility Fees/Rates - w/o increases		\$7,372,553	\$520,400				\$7,892,953
Committed Developer & other Jurisdiction Financing				\$1,200,000			\$1,200,000
Sewer - Water Fees & Assessments				\$180,000			\$180,000
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing committed revenue sources					\$3,292,560		\$3,292,560
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing, general use revenue sources							\$0
Earmarked Carryover Funds (or cap. reserves)	\$90,000	\$1,420,000	\$413,967	\$435,280		\$979,251	\$3,338,498
Internal Department transfers from non-capital programs			\$50,000			\$1,250,000	\$1,300,000
SUBTOTAL	\$474,000	\$8,792,553	\$1,283,267	\$1,815,280	\$43,900,800	\$2,229,251	\$58,495,151
Existing Revenues - General Use (May be used for more than one type of facility)							
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) / General Fund (cash)	\$190,000					\$11,876,824	\$12,066,824
REET. Gen. Fund, or owner assess. (to be determined)				\$960,000			\$960,000
SUBTOTAL	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$960,000	\$0	\$11,876,824	\$13,026,824
Proposed New Revenues or Increased Rates							
GRANTS	\$2,850,000		\$325,500	\$100,000	\$7,133,880		\$10,409,380
Emergency - FEMA, Applicable Co. Reserves, etc.				\$175,000	\$548,760		\$723,760
Utility Rates - portion from increased (or new) rates/assess.			\$4,319,885				\$4,319,885
Utility Loans - to be repaid from increase rates							\$0
Trail Permit Fees	\$140,000						\$140,000
Other	\$13,130,000						\$13,130,000
Not Committed Developer & other Jurisdiction Financing	\$0				\$3,292,560		\$3,292,560
Voter approved bond proceeds - repaid from property tax							\$0
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from new, not yet committed revenue sources.	\$11,850,000					\$31,762,000	\$43,612,000
SUBTOTAL	\$27,970,000	\$0	\$4,645,385	\$275,000	\$10,975,200	\$31,762,000	\$75,627,585
REVENUE TOTALS	\$28,634,000	\$8,792,553	\$5,928,652	\$3,050,280	\$54,876,000	\$45,868,075	\$147,149,560

V. COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES

A summary of the Level of Service Standards for all of the facilities appears at the beginning of this chapter in Section II.

A. Regional Parks, Trails, Open Spaces and Preserves:

Thurston County currently has 25 park sites, accounting for a total of 2,773 acres. These sites include sixteen active parks (791 acres), only four of which are fully or partially developed, six preserves and two historic sites (1,157 acres) and 3 trails, accounting for 42.5 miles of planned 52.7-mile recreational trail system. Approximately 23.0 miles of the trail system will be developed by the end of 2004. The rest of the trail system is currently undeveloped. The county focuses on providing parks, trails and preserves that contain special features intended to be used by all residents of the county, inside and outside cities. Therefore, the county does not provide small neighborhood or community parks of the kind typically found inside cities.

In 2002, the Parks and Recreation Department and Board of County Commissioners adopted an updated Parks Plan and Level of Service Standards. This new plan insures that ongoing work plans and priorities are in line with current needs and demands of the public and is coordinated with efforts and projects of other public agencies.

As a result of this Parks Plan review, it was determined that Thurston County establish a 4.0 acres per 1,000 resident population Level of Service and a 0.5 acre per 1,000 visitor population Level of Service. This 4.5 acre/1,000 level of service standard, based on 2001 resident and visitor population data, creates a need for 896 acres of operational park land.

Since Thurston County has 291.5 acres of park land and trails developed and operational, the net increase of land dedicated for park and trail purposes that meets the LOS standard is 604.5 acres. This LOS standard amounts to a total of 444.5 acres of Urban/Regional Park land, 50 acres of Public/Private Enterprise Park land, and 110 acres of Greenways/Trail lands. Further definition of the Park Classifications and details of park development are found in the Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, Trails and Natural Resource Preserve Plan.

When the proposed land acquisitions in this six year Capital Facilities Plan are added to the current acreage, an adequate level of service is maintained to address the needs and demands of an increasing population through 2010. To insure proper planning for specific needs through the 2020, the Parks Plan is reviewed annually and is fully updated every five years. As part of this long-

range planning process, the county will explore acquisition of valuable active park, preserve or other properties that may become available on an "opportunity to acquire" basis. Park lands to be acquired will be focused on meeting specific needs for types of park facilities, not met by other jurisdictions and/or the private sector. The size and amount of specific recreational facilities will vary from area to area, and for a specific Park sub-classification.

Based on public input, the County has identified the highest priority needs as development and acquisition of multiple use trails, water access sites, athletic fields and other active recreation facilities, picnic sites and natural resource preserves.

User fees are currently being utilized for county parks. The fees support parks operations and maintenance, however, not capital costs.

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

PARKS AND RECREATION OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES:

OBJECTIVE 1-K: *Parks, Trails, and Preserves* - The county should provide parks, trails and preserves to serve all residents of the county, with needs and funding coordinated with other local governments within the county.

POLICIES:

1. The County should work with cities and other local governments to coordinate park needs throughout the county and to identify regional funding strategies.
2. Acquisition of parks, trails and preserves and development rights to farmlands should occur in a coordinated manner, within an overall plan that identifies priorities, funding sources and a timetable for acquisition.
3. County-wide funding methods where the cities and schools districts may participate with the county should be explored as a means of coordinating acquisition, operation, and maintenance of public parks, open spaces, and year-round recreational programs.
4. Large regional parks should be provided by the county to serve all residents of the county. Medium-sized district parks should serve residents of higher intensity growth portions of the unincorporated county. Area residents, adjacent cities and others should participate in the funding for acquisition and support of the medium-sized district parks.

5. The county should cooperate with other public agencies to share public facilities for park and year-round recreation use by county residents.
6. An intergovernmental funding system should be established to acquire, maintain and operate parks and to involve participation by school districts, city and county governments, and others. Such approaches should be explored as county-wide bond measures and a county-wide parks and recreation district.
7. A cooperative program with the cities and school districts should be established to acquire lands for new community and neighborhood parks in the unincorporated urban growth area, as new schools sites are established.
8. Existing schools should be considered as a resource to meet the needs for parks, and the county should help fund the use of school facilities for park and year-round recreational use by county residents.
9. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

NOTE: See Natural Environment Chapter for other park policies.

Table 6-6
PARKS & RECREATION CAPITAL PROJECTS
2005-2010

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005-2010 6 Yr. Total
Capital Balance Forward / from capital reserves	0	10,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	90,000
City of Lacey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Futures	384,000						384,000
Federal Funds	3,138,000	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	6,138,000
Future Councilmanic GO Bonds(Conservation Futures/other source) (1)	4,900,000	500,000	4,450,000	500,000	0	1,500,000	11,850,000
Grants	0	400,000	600,000	500,000	650,000	700,000	2,850,000
Other	500,000	30,000	370,000	220,000	630,000	680,000	2,430,000
Public Facilities District	4,100,000	0	0	0	0	0	4,100,000
REET (Real Estate Excise Tax)	65,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	190,000
Trail Permit Fees	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000	50,000	140,000
WSDOT	462,000	0	0	0	0	0	462,000
TOTALS	\$13,559,000	\$3,975,000	\$5,475,000	\$1,275,000	\$1,375,000	\$2,975,000	\$28,634,000

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Type	Fund Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 Yr. Total
Regional Athletic Complex (5)	Dev	PFD	4,100,000	0	0	0	500,000	0	4,600,000
Regional Athletic Complex Property (PFD)	Acq	CFB	2,900,000						2,900,000
Glacial Heritage Preserve	Renov	R	50,000	0	0	0	0	0	50,000
Kenneydell Park (4)	Dev	G, O	0	0	300,000	0	0	0	300,000
Major Maint./Repair	Dev	R, T, C	25,000	50,000	75,000	50,000	50,000	75,000	325,000
Master Plans	MP	R, T, C	0	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	75,000
Chehalis Western Trail	Dev	C, G, T, O, BF	0	400,000	700,000	0	600,000	200,000	1,900,000
Chehalis Western Trail (Bridging the Gap Project)	Acq/Dev	L, G, B, O	3,600,000	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	6,600,000
Yelm - Tenino Trail (2)	Dev	C, G, T, B, O	0		1,000,000		0	200,000	1,200,000
Griffin Athletic Fields (3)	Dev	G	0	0	400,000	0	200,000	0	600,000
Guerin Park	Dev	G, O, B	0	0	0	200,000	0	1,000,000	1,200,000
Deschutes Falls Park (2)	Dev	B	0		2,500,000	0	0	0	2,500,000
Cooper Point Park	Acq	CF, CFB	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000,000
Deschutes Falls Park	Acq	CF, CFB	250,000	0	0	0	0	0	250,000
Gull Harbor Conservation Project	Acq	CF, CFB	134,000	0	0	0	0	0	134,000
Allen Property	Acq	D	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	500,000
Reserve for Acq & Development	300A	CFB, G, O	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	1,000,000	0	1,500,000	4,500,000
TOTALS			\$13,559,000	\$3,975,000	\$5,475,000	\$1,275,000	\$1,375,000	\$2,975,000	\$28,634,000

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Future Bonds	458,755	711,955	1,065,567	1,419,180	1,419,180	1,621,532	6,696,169
Total Debt Service	\$458,755	\$711,955	\$1,065,567	\$1,419,180	\$1,419,180	\$1,621,532	\$6,696,169

LEGEND:

B	Bonds (See Note #1)	L	City of Lacey	PFD	Public Facilities District
C	County Budget Allocation/Capital Fund	O	Donations, Other Sources	D	Donations
CFB	Conservation Futures Bond (nonvoter GO bond to be financed from existing Conservation. Futures Property Tax)	R	Real Estate Excise Tax	CF	Conservation Futures
G	Grant	T	Trail Permit Fees		
		BF	Capital Balance Forward		

NOTE: (1) These are bonds paid for by outside revenue sources, either voter approved from the property tax, or councilmatic paid from existing revenue sources such as Conservation Futures or other sources.

(2) These projects would be funded if a source for repaying bonds is found (e.g., property tax approved by the voters, existing revenue sources, or a combination).

(3) The Griffin Athletic Fields are a joint project with the Griffin School District and are being constructed on school district property.

(4) Tumwater UGA

(5) Lacey UGA

B. Solid Waste:

Thurston County provides the facilities for disposing of solid wastes generated in the county. The County operates the Thurston County Solid Waste and Recovery Center (WARC) and several drop box facilities - one near Rainier, Rochester and at Summit Lake. A Solid Waste Advisory Committee comprised of citizens, industry representatives and local elected officials review and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners concerning all solid waste management policy and funding issues. A Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, prepared by the County and its cities, was adopted by the cities and County and approved by the Department of Ecology in 1994. This plan identifies solid waste management needs, including capital facilities and cost projections for a 20-year period. The Plan was updated during 2001, adopted in 2002 and provides the basis for the facilities described in this Capital Facilities Plan.

Identified in Table 6 – 7 are several projects for 2004 which are also included in the 2005 CFP projects list. These projects were not completed in 2004 therefore have been included in the 2005–2010 CFP. Unspent funds for those projects will be included in the 2004 ending fund balance. For the completion of the projects it was necessary to include funding in the 2005 CFP projects list. Projects included in this list are: Recycling Center Modification, HazoHouse, Public Tipping Area, and Rochester Drop Box site upgrades.

New capital projects for the next six years include, the transfer station at the WARC, and miscellaneous repairs and maintenance as needed for both regular and landfill post-closure items. In 2002, construction was completed for the final capping of the current fill area at the Thurston County landfill, commonly called: Cell #1. Part of the closure activities includes construction of a gas migration control facility and new permanent ground flare for collection and destruction of landfill gasses. This work took place during– 2001-2002. Subsequently, all landfill construction, repair and maintenance will be classified as post – closure and funded through a post – closure reserve.

Another capital project, the construction of a transfer station, began in 1999 and was completed in April 2000. In 2007 the County will go through the process of assessing the need for the Transfer Station expansion that is identified for construction in 2010. The County has contracted with a private garbage company - Allied/Regional Disposal Company of Seattle, to site, construct and operate a transfer station, which receives garbage collected in the county. The garbage is processed at the transfer station and hauled to a rail facility in Centralia where it is loaded onto a train and transported to the Roosevelt Regional Landfill near Goldendale, Washington.

The transfer station construction was financed by Thurston County out of its solid waste reserves.

In addition to new capital projects, the majority of “capital projects” associated with solid waste occur as part of ongoing maintenance and repairs at the Thurston County landfill. Other expected maintenance and repair project are listed in Table 6-10.

Summary of Six Year Costs and Method of Payment: All costs associated with capital projects for solid waste facilities are paid for from rates and charges (landfill tipping fees). The public and commercial users pay tipping fees directly when they use the landfill or transfer station. If they do not haul their garbage directly themselves, they pay through the fees they are charged to have their garbage collected at home or their place of business by their municipal or private hauler.

The current tipping fee for waste is \$67.79 per ton plus a \$3.07 per trip fee. The solid waste rates provide more than 90% of the funding for the solid waste programs. The additional 10% of revenues is provided through state grants, direct payment for some of the recycling and hazardous waste programs (such as the \$35.00 per ton fees for bringing yard and garden trimmings to the compost center) and interest earned on existing reserve accounts.

The solid waste tipping fees provides funding for all solid waste management in the County including costs for construction, closure and post-closure, maintenance, compliance, operations, staff, planning, environmental monitoring and care of leachate and storm water facilities. Grants, a portion of the tipping fees, and minor other revenues listed above also fund ongoing recycling and hazardous waste programs, solid waste enforcement for illegal dumping complaint response and other general solid waste management requirements.

A twenty-year cost projection study was conducted in 2002-03. The resulting existing rate structure anticipates the need for a solid waste rate increase every four years over the 20-year period to fully fund all anticipated costs for the solid waste system.

The last rate increase was effective January 1, 2004 when rates of \$67.79 per ton and \$3.07 per trip took effect for the period January 1, 2004 - December 2004.

In 2003 the Board of County Commissioners elected to implement new Solid Waste rates on an annual basis. Solid waste rates are adopted by Ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners and are part of the Thurston County Code.

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

SOLID WASTE OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES:

OBJECTIVE 1-F: *Solid and Hazardous Waste Facilities* - Thurston County should provide for solid waste disposal and recycling facilities to serve all jurisdictions within the County in accordance with a Solid Waste Plan developed and adopted jointly with all the cities and approved by the State Department of Ecology.

POLICY:

1. Any future solid waste handling facilities will be operated in a manner that protects ground and surface water quality, and include recycling/reduction programs instituted to prolong its useful life.

NOTE: See Natural Environment Chapter for other policies related to solid and hazardous waste management.

Table 6-7
THURSTON COUNTY
SOLID WASTE CAPITAL PROJECTS
2005-2010

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

REVENUES	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 Yr Total for 2005-2010
<i>Utility Fees & Rates</i>	\$2,832,353	\$530,000	\$270,200	\$502,000	\$331,000	\$2,907,000	\$7,372,553
<i>Post Closure Reserve</i>	\$4,000	\$804,000	\$39,000	\$519,000	\$4,000	\$50,000	\$1,420,000
<i>Total CFP Revenues</i>	\$2,836,353	\$1,334,000	\$309,200	\$1,021,000	\$335,000	\$2,957,000	\$8,792,553
PROJECT EXPENDITURES	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 Yr Total for 2004 - 2009
Construction - Maintenance & Repair Projects:							
Support Services	23,000	25,000	26,000	27,000	28,000	30,000	159,000
Closetloop Park upgrades	15,000			10,000			25,000
WARC Building Repairs		5,000			5,000		10,000
Rainier Drop Box Repairs			5,000	5,000			10,000
Rochester Drop Box upgrades	834,117			5,000			839,117
Summit Lake Drop Box Repairs			1,200			2,000	3,200
Lakeside site building - repairs.	50,000		200,000				250,000
Landscape repair	5,000			5,000			10,000
Compost Center Repairs		50,000				50,000	100,000
Hazo House	700,000						700,000
Recycling Modifications	57,330				10,000		67,330
Public Tipping area	937,906			300,000	50,000	50,000	1,337,906
Tollhouse Scales	150,000	150,000		150,000		75,000	525,000
Transfer Station						2,500,000	2,500,000
Landfill Access Road		50,000	38,000				88,000
Pave Metal Recycling	60,000						60,000
North Maintenance Building		250,000					250,000
Develop 40 Acre Site					200,000	200,000	400,000
Landfill Access Road Repairs					38,000		38,000
Const. - Maint/Repair Subtotal	\$2,832,353	\$530,000	\$270,200	\$502,000	\$331,000	\$2,907,000	\$7,372,553
Landfill Post - Closure Projects:							
Gas System Repair				500,000			500,000
Ground Water Monitoring System	4,000	4,000	39,000	4,000	4,000	50,000	105,000
Leachate Facilities		200,000					200,000
Landfill Maintenance		200,000					200,000
Sprinkler system - repairs				15,000			15,000
Settlement regrade		400,000					400,000
Post - Closure Subtotal	\$4,000	\$804,000	\$39,000	\$519,000	\$4,000	\$50,000	\$1,420,000
Expenditure Totals	\$2,836,353	\$1,334,000	\$309,200	\$1,021,000	\$335,000	\$2,957,000	\$8,792,553

NOTES:

1. The revenues for Capital during 2005-2010 are from a combination of existing rates, reserves and projected rate increase for 2005.
2. The Recycling Modification, HazoHouse, Public Tipping Area, and Rochester Drop Box upgrades are projects that were identified and funded in the 2003 CFP. The projects were not completed in 2003. Consequently, they have been included in the 2004 - 2009 CFP. Unspent funds for those projects will be included in the 2003 ending fund balance. For the completion of the projects it was necessary to include funding in the 2004 CFP projects list.
3. The post closure projects are funded through an established reserve required prior to the closure of the landfill.

C. Stormwater Facilities:

The Storm and Surface Water Utility, Basin Plans, and 20 year Capital Facility Plan: In 1989 Thurston County instituted rates and charges for a stormwater utility in the northern part of the county pursuant to RCW 36.89. This money has been used by the County for cooperative work with the north county cities to identify existing and anticipated future stormwater drainage problems and corrective actions. This work is done largely through stormwater basin plans.

The stormwater utility has completed nine basin plans to date, having partnered with the cities on two others and shared with the three cities the cost of constructing facilities within the Woodland, Chambers and Moxlie Basins. Planning for the peninsulas and more rural basins will be undertaken to complete the planning for all the north county drainage basins as funding and priorities allow.

The stormwater facilities in this Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) are for projects identified in the completed stormwater basin plans and placed on the 20-year stormwater CFP, as well as for capital projects intended to address emerging environmental or regulatory issues relating to flooding, water quality and/or habitat degradation. Annually, projects are comprehensively reviewed and prioritized according to a ranking system that considers the ability to implement (e.g. availability of funding, and effect on tax base, ongoing maintenance costs), level of environmental sustainability (e.g. level of protection of aquatic resources, water quality, shellfish protection, etc.), effectiveness in solving the problems and accommodating future growth, prevention of property damage, public safety, and compliance with the program's mission of approaching problems comprehensively, cooperating interjurisdictionally and meeting six year growth projections. Once projects were ranked, consideration was given to drainage basin representation.

Types of Stormwater Facilities:

There are three typical categories of stormwater facilities.

Flood Control Facilities: New storage facilities, additional dry well disposal systems, enlarged conveyances with new collection and detention systems within existing developed areas.

Water Quality Facilities: Install or retrofit treatment devices to existing dry well systems, wet ponds, sand filters, constructed wetlands, vaults, or other new technologies.

Habitat Facilities/Surveys: Install in-stream structures to improve fish passage and improve downgradient shellfish habitat. (Placement of

large woody debris, riparian cover, bank stabilization projects are not included in the CFP, but in the stormwater base budget.) Conduct habitat surveys to identify and quantify stream health and downgradient shellfish areas.

In many instances, flood control facilities which provide additional storage also provide water quality and habitat improvements. The additional storage can allow settling of pollutant-carrying sediments. The storage also provides additional detention time, before peak flows enter the stream system. This aids in reducing stream channel erosion and excessive flows, which can inhibit fish passage and degrade shellfish areas.

None of these stormwater facilities include combining stormwater with sewage (CSO's) and transporting to a treatment plant.

The majority of the proposed stormwater capital facility projects in this plan are to correct or alleviate existing flooding, water quality or habitat problems, as well as address public health and safety issues.

Dedicated Storm and Surface Water Utility Rates and Charges for Capital Facilities:

Table 6-9 highlights specific capital facility projects, which will be designed and constructed with a dedicated stormwater capital facility rate. The projects on this 6-year list are taken from the 20-year CFP that in turn is based upon projects identified in adopted stormwater basin plans and projects intended to address emerging issues. Several projects will be constructed within the Lacey and Olympia Urban Growth Area (UGA) with the majority of these being within Lacey's UGA. Reimbursement for county-funded capital expenditures within the respective UGAs is subject to further review and decision. From initial assessment, revenues generated by the rates and charges for each city's Stormwater Utility may not be sufficient to reimburse the county for the capital costs associated with constructing stormwater facilities within annexed areas. Policy decisions related to future annexation proposals should address the issue of reimbursement.

Stormwater Needs of South County:

This plan includes no stormwater facilities for the area of Thurston County located outside of the present Storm and Surface Water Utility boundary (e.g. South County). South County has flooding and drainage problems, of which were highlighted during flood events in the winter of 1995-1996, and again in 1996-1997 and 1998-1999.

Beginning in 1997, the County met with citizens to seek ideas for the best way to address flooding in south Thurston County. By 1999, there was enough public interest to expand the Storm and Surface Water Utility services and apply its rates and charges to the Salmon Creek Drainage Basin, located south of Tumwater, WA. Rates and charges from within the expanded boundary, combined with a grant and a portion of the real estate excise tax, funded a study to define the basin's stormwater and shallow groundwater problems, as well as identify possible solutions. The Storm and Surface Water Utility rates and charges took effect for the Salmon Creek Drainage Basin in August 1999.

[Resolutions No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

STORMWATER OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

OBJECTIVE 1-G: *Stormwater Facilities* - Thurston County will coordinate with jurisdictions that share stormwater drainage basins to provide stormwater facilities and related management programs that protect surface and ground water quality and habitat, prevent chronic flooding from stormwater, maintain natural stream hydrology and protect aquatic resources.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County will work with local governments within the same drainage basins to develop common standards and design requirements for stormwater facilities. The County will also plan together with the other jurisdictions for major regional stormwater facilities. Maintenance of stormwater facilities, such as retention ponds and street drainage systems, could be handled by each jurisdiction separately or together with other jurisdictions.
2. Stormwater utility rates should recognize and implement other Comprehensive Plan recommendations such as providing incentives to preserve agriculture and forestry lands through reduced rates.
3. Comprehensive Drainage Basin Plans will be used to identify and prioritize necessary stormwater services and capital facilities. As new Basin Plans are adopted, the County should periodically review and update the Stormwater element of the Capital Facilities Plan. Basin Plans should also be periodically reviewed and updated to address changing environmental conditions.

4. Thurston County should address emerging flooding, water quality, and habitat issues as they arise and in a timely manner to avoid adverse impacts to residents, critical areas, resource lands, or infrastructure.

NOTE: See Natural Environment and Utilities Chapters for other policies related to stormwater management.

Table 6-8
2005 - 2010 Stormwater Capital Facilities

REVENUE	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR TOTAL
Retained Earnings	413,967	162,267	90,417	311,217	236,592	258,892	1,473,352
Investment Earnings	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	120,000
Rates and Charges- Resolution 11860	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	3,000,000
Project Planning and Support- Fund 406	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	300,000
Partner funding, grants, loans, etc.	624,400	108,500	0	0	0	300,000	1,032,900
Miscellaneous Income	400	400	400	400	400	400	2,400
REVENUE TOTAL:	\$1,608,767	\$841,167	\$660,817	\$881,617	\$806,992	\$1,129,292	\$5,928,652

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Funding Source	Objective	UGA ¹	2005		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		6 YR TOTAL
Project Planning and Support	SSWU CFP	H/F/WQ	NA	100,000		105,000		110,250		115,750		121,500		127,750		680,250
CLT Green Cove Creek Basin Project	CLT, SSWU CFP	H/WQ	NA	298,900	LA											298,900
Pacific Avenue Wetland	SSWU CFP	H	Lacey	15,000	PSE	225,000	PSE/CN									240,000
Mallard Pond	SSWU CFP	H/F/WQ	Lacey	375,000	PSE/CN											375,000
Thompson Place 1- Stormwater Pond	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	NA	150,000	LA/PSE	67,250	PSE/CN									217,250
SCB- Elevating Roadways	SSWU CFP, GRANT	F/WQ	Turnwater	371,950	PSE/CN	124,000	PSE/CN					200,000	PSE/CN	150,000	PSE/CN	845,950
Limerick Detention Pond	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Olympia					11,400	PSE/CN	159,600	PSE/CN					171,000
Lakemont and 49 ^h	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Lacey			204,500	PSE/CN									204,500
South Bay Road Culvert ^c	SSWU CFP	H	Olympia			25,000	CN									25,000
Green Cove Detention Pond (GC8.1)	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Olympia					10,950	PSE	206,175	PSE/CN					217,125
Kaiser Road (GC8.3) ²	SSWU CFP	F	NA									50,000	CN			50,000
Ferndale Detention Pond	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Olympia									151,600	PSE			151,600
Clearfield Court	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Olympia					192,000	PSE/CN							192,000
Little McAllister Mouth	SSWU CFP	F/H	NA					25,000	CN							25,000
Evergreen Terrace	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Lacey							163,500	PSE/CN					163,500
Hawaiian Court	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Lacey	135,650	PSE/CN											135,650
Delphi and 11th	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	NA									25,000	PSE	250,000	CN	275,000
SCB- West Basin Alternative	SSWU CFP, GRANT	F/WQ	Turnwater											300,000	PSE	300,000
Capital Carryover				162,267		90,417		311,217		236,592		258,892		301,542		1,360,927
EXPENDITURE TOTALS:				\$1,608,767		\$841,167		\$660,817		\$881,617		\$806,992		\$1,129,292		\$5,928,652

KEY: L=Loan, C=Carryover, SSWU=Storm and Surface Water Utility, Conserv= Conservation Futures Fund, RF=Road Fund, CLT= Capital Land Trust and/or its other partners, Grant=Grant funding;
WQ=Water Quality; F=Flooding, H=Habitat, PSE=Design plans, specifications and estimates, CN=Construction, RW=Right of Way, LA= Land Acquisition

Notes:

¹ UGA - Urban Growth Area. NA indicates the projects is not within the current urban growth areas of Olympia, Lacey, or Turnwater.

D. Water and Sewer Systems:**Rural Areas:**

It is Thurston County's policy not to serve rural areas with municipal-type sewer and water systems. Therefore, this plan does not provide for systematic construction of rural sewer and water systems. An exception is made where there is water quality or health problems from existing development built at densities higher than would be allowed by current rural zoning. For this reason, the county operates very few systems in the rural area, and there are adopted plans for those systems (Example: Boston Harbor). However, from time to time, other rural systems may experience failure. In those cases the county will work with local residents to plan, design and construct sewer and water systems to solve these local problems. In some cases, solutions other than sewer and water systems may be appropriate. Given the number of small private community water systems throughout the county and the increasing numbers of septic systems that are failing or contributing to water quality problems, it is recognized that the county may have to use its financial resources to assist local residents to identify and make needed improvements. A recent example is the study completed for the Cooper Point area. The inventory, Table 6-15, lists all of the county operated systems.

This plan also recognizes that some existing small private rural water systems may fail financially and become a county responsibility by default. It is hard to anticipate how many may fail, but this plan provides some up front money to engineer and repair a few systems until a funding mechanism is put in place for repayment by users of the system.

Urban Growth Areas:

Around cities: Sewer and water systems are expected to be provided to unincorporated parts of areas identified and zoned for urban growth, with these systems constructed as the areas urbanize. The cities are typically responsible for extending these services to the unincorporated parts of urban growth areas.

Grand Mound: An urban growth area has been established in this unincorporated area since the late 1970s. Its boundaries and zoning were updated in 1995. A Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) was formed through approval by the community in late 1996 to provide sewer and water system improvements in the Grand Mound UGA. Improvements are complete and the systems are in operations for service within the urban growth area.

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

WATER AND SEWER OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

OBJECTIVE 1-H: Sewer Systems - Sewer systems should be provided in designated urban growth areas and in rural areas only under limited circumstances.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County should allow sewer systems in designated urban growth areas. In rural areas, sewer systems should be allowed only to correct identified health hazards or water quality deficiencies of areas of existing development. Expansion or extension into rural areas must be consistent with the Growth Management Act.
2. Decisions on the design capacity and service area designation for such sewer systems in rural areas should be made with consideration of adopted zoning designations of adjacent areas.
3. Where sewer systems are being provided to unincorporated rural areas or the Rochester-Grand Mound area, Thurston County should be the primary sewer system provider through the County Services Act.
4. In unincorporated areas inside the Urban Growth Areas around cities and towns, the cities should be the primary sewer provider. As an exception, the county could provide sewers in a UGA on an interim basis (if the cities are unable to provide the service) or to protect water quality.
5. Utility services within growth areas should be phased outward from the urbanizing core as that core becomes substantially developed, in order to concentrate urban growth and infilling.

NOTE: Other related policies dealing with sewer systems and water quality are found in the Natural Environment.

6. The County should develop, and periodically review and update, a comprehensive sewerage general plan for all unincorporated rural areas where there are health and water quality problems related to sewage in areas of existing development, and in all urban growth areas where no sewerage planning has been done.

OBJECTIVE 1-I: *Sewage Treatment and Disposal* - All factors and impacts should be considered in determining appropriate sewage treatment and disposal methods.

POLICIES:

1. Waste water disposal methods should be determined by considering all factors, such as environmental impacts, long-term effects, technical feasibility, cost effectiveness and especially the maintenance and improvement of water quality.
2. Sewage collection, treatment, and disposal alternatives should be encouraged where feasible, where water quality can be protected and/or where appropriate operation and maintenance are provided.
3. Alternative methods of sewage collection, treatment, and disposal should be discouraged in areas where sewer service is provided or planned. In other areas, they should be considered only when an acceptable plan for operation and maintenance is provided, and they will not adversely affect ground and surface water quality and/or public health.
4. The county should monitor the functioning of on-site sewage systems and require that they be maintained in a condition that will assure their longevity, protect public health, and prevent contamination of surface and ground water.
5. The County should periodically review and update the capacity and alternatives for sewage treatment related to the limits of the LOTT treatment plant.
6. The County should Review and revise policies for on-site sewage management alternatives to comply with the above policies and adopted state sewage disposal regulations.
7. The County should examine the building code for standards for low-water use fixtures, and should make available to residents literature comparing efficiency of low-water use fixtures and issues related to the no-flow alternative.

NOTE: Ecology does not allow discharge of chlorine.

OBJECTIVE 1-J: *Water Supply Facilities* - Drinking water service inside urban growth areas should be provided by cities or private utility systems which are the designated service providers through coordinated water system planning; the County should provide drinking water systems in rural areas only under limited circumstances.

POLICIES:

1. In order to resolve documented health hazards, safety or pollution in areas of existing rural development, the county may serve as the water utility owner, or develop a proactive assistance program focused on keeping small distribution systems in private ownership.
- 2 In rural areas where the county provides sewer service, the county or a private utility system should also be the water provider.

NOTE: See Natural Environment and Utilities Chapters for other policies related to management of water systems and water resources.

Table 6-9
THURSTON COUNTY
SEWER and WATER CAPITAL PROJECTS
2005-2010

Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)

PROJECT Description	Revenue Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR TOTAL
Retained Earnings		\$93,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$435,280
Utility Development- Water/Sewer	GenFund/REET/ULID	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$360,000
Remedial Repairs- Water/Sewer	GenFund/REET/ULID	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$600,000
Major Maintenance & Repair- All Water/Sewer Utilities	Water / Sewer Rates	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$180,000
BH Water Tank Construction/Demolition	FEMA / Insurance	\$175,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000
Grand Mound Water System- pH Adjustment	Grant or Other	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
Grand Mound Water/Sewer Systems - WSDOT Connection <i>Unknown if this will be County Construction Project</i>	Developer or Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,000
REVENUE TOTALS		\$558,380	\$258,380	\$258,380	\$1,458,380	\$258,380	\$258,380	\$3,050,280

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Funding Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR TOTAL
Utility Development- Water/Sewer <i>(a partially revolving fund--see note)</i>	GenFund/REET/ULID	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$360,000
Remedial Repairs- Water/Sewer <i>(a partially revolving fund--see note)</i>	GenFund/REET/ULID	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$600,000
Major Maintenance & Repair- All Water/Sewer Utilities	Water / Sewer Rates	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$180,000
BH Water Tank Construction/Demolition	FEMA / Insurance	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000
Grand Mound Water System- pH Adjustment	Grant or Other	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
Grand Mound Water/Sewer Systems - WSDOT Connection <i>Unknown if this will be County Construction Project</i>	Developer or Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,000
<i>Capital Carryover</i>		\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$68,380	\$410,280
EXPENDITURE TOTALS		\$558,380	\$258,380	\$258,380	\$1,458,380	\$258,380	\$258,380	\$3,050,280

DEBT SERVICE ON BONDS & LOANS By Project & Revenue Source	Funding Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR. TOTAL
20 yr., '99 LTGO Bond for Grand Mound	ULID	\$472,000	\$472,000	\$472,000	\$472,000	\$472,000	\$472,000	\$2,832,000
20 yr., '99 LTGO Bond for Grand Mound	Water GFC	\$240,900	\$251,400	\$289,200	\$289,900	\$344,900	\$343,525	\$1,759,825
20 yr., '99 LTGO Bond for Grand Mound	Sewer GFC	\$619,450	\$646,450	\$743,650	\$745,450	\$886,750	\$883,400	\$4,525,150
Tamoshan & Beverly Beach Loan Repayment	ULID	\$78,300	\$78,300	\$78,300	\$78,300	\$78,300	\$78,300	\$469,800
DEBT SERVICE TOTALS		\$1,011,150	\$1,448,150	\$1,583,150	\$1,585,650	\$1,781,950	\$1,777,225	\$9,586,775

NOTES:

UTILITY DEVELOPMENT- WATER/SEWER:

The expenditures are annual placeholders to cover very preliminary community assistance in response to emerging water and sewerage issues as they occur. Community assistance would include identification of financial resources. Limited engineering services would be funded either by the benefiting property owners through assessments, grants, or from a county revenue source, such as REET or General Fund. The latter would perhaps be on an up-front basis for eventual repayment by the benefiting property owners. The Board of County Commissioners would decide which revenue source to use before allocating the annual amount.

REMEDIAL REPAIRS- WATER/SEWER:

These are annual placeholder amounts to cover engineering services needed in cases where the preliminary community assistance noted above under utility development warrants further work. Projects in this category will be pursued only after Board of Commissioner approval, and after determining the source of revenue to be used. The same revenue sources would be considered as noted under utility development.

MAJOR MAINTENANCE & REPAIR- ALL WATER/SEWER UTILITIES:

For non-specified major maintenance and equipment replacement as part of routine water and sewer utility operations.

BOSTON HARBOR WATER TANK CONSTRUCTION:

Carryover costs of construction related to the new 500,000 gallon water tank, which replaces the existing damaged water tank.

BOSTON HARBOR WATER TANK DEMO/REHABILITATION:

Provides for either the demolition or rehabilitation of the existing 500,000 gallon water tank, which was damaged in the Feb 2001 Nisqually Earthquake.

E. Transportation:

This section of the Capital Facilities Plan includes those transportation facilities that Thurston County government is responsible for providing (roads, bridges, bike paths and sidewalks). It does not include facilities provided by other entities such as, transit or park and ride lots. Intercity Transit provides transit; and Intercity Transit and the State Department of Transportation provide park-and-ride lots. Road maintenance is not included as part of the capital program; maintenance costs are met from funds earmarked for maintenance.

Safety improvements reflect current road safety standards applied by county engineers. The projects are for "spot"-type improvements to improve safety. They include such things as guardrails, spot roadway alignments, channelization, traffic signal installations or upgrades and railroad crossing signal installations.

Design Standard improvements are upgrades to the existing roadway system to address current design standards. These improvements do not add additional lanes except sometimes at intersections. The needed improvements provide greater lane width, improve roadway curves, or load carrying capacity. They may include safety features and add paved shoulders for multiple uses. Other separate facilities may also be provided for pedestrians and bicycles.

Capacity improvements provide new roads, new lanes, or other improvements that provide greater traffic carrying capacity of existing roads to meet the needs of new growth. The capacity road needs in this Thurston County plan are those identified in the 1998 adopted Regional Transportation Plan, or those approved by Thurston Regional Planning Council as consistent with the plan and which they consider candidates for inclusion in the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan.

Level of Service (LOS) Standards: The adopted standards for urban and rural unincorporated areas are:

- Urban Growth Areas:
 - Grand Mound Urban Growth Area: D
 - For urban growth areas around cities and towns, the standards are those adopted in joint plans with the cities.
The standards are as follows:
Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater: D for highways and arterials
E for high-density residential corridors
Yelm: C for residential areas
D for commercial and light industrial zones

Tenino & Rainier: D for arterials (and major collectors in Rainier)

Exception: Yelm Highway (Henderson to Rich Road) may drop below LOS D in the short-term. The current approach is to not have roads including Yelm Highway widened to more than a 4/5 lane facility.

- Rural Areas (outside Urban Growth Area boundaries): C

Exceptions -- to operate at D:

1. Mud Bay Road (from Urban Growth boundary west to Highway 101)
2. Yelm Highway (from Urban Growth boundary at BNRR east to Fair Oaks Rd. SW)

The reason the latter two roadways are allowed to operate at LOS D is that they function differently than most other rural roadways. The Mud Bay Road section is a primary link between the Olympia westside urban area and Highway 101. The Yelm Highway section operates as a primary link between the Olympia southeast urban area and the Lacey southeast urban area. In effect, though outside urban boundaries, they function as urban roadways, providing links between urban areas, or between an urban area and a freeway.

Improvements in this Plan:

Safety: The proposed safety improvements include those that could receive matching funds from state and federal grant programs. There is considerable competition for limited grant funding. In addition to the availability of grant funds, there is the question of difference in priority between the County and the granting agency. It is not unusual for the County's second choice project to be the first choice of the granting agency. Therefore, the County typically submits more projects than there is a likelihood of receiving grant funding. This Capital Facilities Plan, particularly in the later years, reflects more projects than are anticipated to be funded.

The County will be considering eliminating or reducing its limited funds budgeted for making some spot improvements that are not eligible to receive grant funds. These projects would be prioritized after reviewing accident history records. Generally the projects would occur where minor improvements such as improving the sight distance of the driver or providing turn lanes would be of benefit.

Capacity: All improvements needed to provide for increased traffic capacity to meet current and future population growth at adopted Level of Service Standards are included in this plan, with the exception of the Yelm Highway segment in the Olympia Urban Growth Area between Henderson

to Rich Road as noted on pages 6-12 to 6-13. Congestion on this portion of the highway may drop below LOS D in the short. The South Connector Corridor study completed in late 1998 recommended that a new corridor not be pursued in the south urban area until such time as traffic conditions warrant a new corridor. Furthermore, it recommended that Yelm Highway be widened to include four through lanes, two in each direction, and other road standards that may be incorporated without undue impacts to adjacent property owners. Preliminary design was completed in 2001. Grant funding is necessary to complete the construction. Grant applications will be made for construction funding upon completion of the design and environmental review.

Working Reserves: To compensate for not receiving grants or lower percentage of grant participation than anticipated, and for emergencies or unanticipated safety upgrades not specifically listed by name in the plan, a "working reserves" category is included in the plan. This project list includes more projects (of the non-capacity types) than are expected to receive grant funding, so that those projects that are on the granting agencies' high priority list will appear in our Capital Facilities Plan and can be constructed if funding is received. Non-capacity projects in this plan that are not carried out (or delayed) because the needed grant is not received will not affect concurrency and level of service standards because these apply to capacity projects, not safety and design standard improvements.

Design Standard Improvements - Bonds: There still remains a long list of road safety upgrade needs that have been accumulating over the years because they are ineligible or are a low priority for state-federal transportation grants, and they exceed the amount of money available through the county's road fund. This plan proposes the use of more county road funds and continues the policy established in the 1994-1999 Capital Facilities Plan of beginning to reduce this list by funding a portion of the improvements through councilmanic bonds, with the debt service paid from a portion of the county's existing road fund revenues.

(Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03))

OBJECTIVE 1-K: Coordinate with Budget and Related Documents – The County's capital budget and six year transportation program will be consistent with the Capital Facilities Plan.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County's annual capital budget and six year transportation program required under RCW 36.81.121 will be fully consistent with the

intent and substance of this Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan.

2. The year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Comprehensive Plan due to:
 - a. Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the county with conditions about when they may be used, or
 - b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve new development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.
3. Specific debt financing proposals may vary from that shown in the Comprehensive Plan due to changes in interest rates, other terms of financing, or other conditions which make the proposals in the plan not advantageous financially.
4. The addition of an entirely new facility, not anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan, will require formal amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The transportation projects in the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan will be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Thurston County Comprehensive Plan

Capital Facilities

Table 6-10
THURSTON COUNTY
ROADS and TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS
2005-2010
Numbers in the Thousands of dollars

REVENUE FOR PROJECTS FUND SOURCE	% of Total	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR TOTAL
GRANTS	Total Progr-	630.63	1,064.31	1,731.08	532.74	716.56	2,458.56	7,133.88
ROAD FUND AMOUNT FOR PROJECTS	74%	3,589.74	6,058.38	9,853.84	3,032.52	4,078.88	13,994.88	40,608.24
OTHER (DEVELOPER OR OTHER AGENCY)	6%	291.06	491.22	798.96	245.88	330.72	1,134.72	3,292.56
NON-VOTED G.O. BOND PROCEEDS (10Yr.)	6%	291.06	491.22	798.96	245.88	330.72	1,134.72	3,292.56
FEMA, Roads, Private for Emergency/Landslide	1%	48.51	81.87	133.16	40.98	55.12	189.12	548.76
TOTALS	100%	\$4,851.00	\$8,187.00	\$13,316.00	\$4,098.00	\$5,512.00	\$18,912.00	\$54,876.00

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR. TOTAL
From Road Fund on 10 Yr. Proceeds						\$743.00	\$743.00	\$1,486.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								

CITY OF OLYMPIA GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
CAPACITY								
Mud Bay Rd Capacity Project Widen 4/5 lanes and signalization Delphi Rd to Kaiser Rd	GN/O				253.00			253.00
Yelm Hwy Capacity Project Henderson to Rich	GN/L	1,000.00	373.00	5,000.00				6,373.00
Chehalis Western Trail Bridging the Gap	GN/O	400.00	200.00	400.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	1,000.00	6,000.00
SAFETY								
26th Ave Upgrade Intersection (West leg) at South Bay	GN/L				20.00	20.00	230.00	270.00
CITY OF OLYMPIA GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$1,400.00	\$573.00	\$5,400.00	\$2,273.00	\$2,020.00	\$1,230.00	\$12,896.00

CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
CAPACITY								
Carpenter Rd Capacity Project Widen to 4 Lanes Pacific Ave to Martin Way - Except City	GN/O/L	140.00	350.00	1,800.00				2,290.00
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
15th Ave Upgrade Sleater-Kinney to Carpenter Rd	GN/L				280.00	500.00	5,420.00	6,200.00
Duterrrow Rd Upgrade Steilacoom Rd to Martin Way	GC/L	72.00	911.00					983.00
Kinwood Street Upgrade Pacific Ave to Martin Way	GN/L				67.00	180.00	713.00	960.00
Meridian Rd Upgrade Martin Way to Lacey City Limits	GN/L					1,000.00	4,900.00	5,900.00
SAFETY								
Carpenter/Shady Ln/20th Ave Intersection Left Turn Channelization	GN/L						25.00	25.00
Pacific Ave/Kinwood Intersection Signalization & Channelization	GC/L/O	450.00						450.00
BRIDGES								
Yelm Hwy Bridge O-12 Replacement at Burlington Northern RR Crossing	GN/L				197.00	20.00	1,288.00	1,505.00
CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$662.00	\$1,261.00	\$1,800.00	\$544.00	\$1,700.00	\$12,346.00	\$18,313.00

Thurston County Comprehensive Plan

Capital Facilities

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								

CITY OF TUMWATER GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
Henderson Blvd Upgrade Old Hwy 99 to Airdustrial	GN/L					63.00	827.00	890.00
54th Ave Upgrade Trosper Rd to Tumwater City Limits	GN/L					56.00	744.00	800.00
88th Ave Upgrade Case to Old Hwy 99	GN/L						5.00	5.00
70th Ave Upgrade Kirsop to Tumwater City Limits	GN/L					60.00	200.00	260.00
Trosper Rd Upgrade 49th Ave to 54th Ave	GN/L					10.00	190.00	200.00
Black Lake-Belmore Rd Upgrade 66th to Sapp	GN/L					92.00	200.00	292.00
SAFETY								
93rd/Lathrop Industrial Drive Intersection Channelization	L/O					210.00		210.00
Old Hwy 99/93rd Ave SW Intersection Channelization and Realign 93rd	GC	92.00	300.00					392.00
Henderson/Tumwater Boulevard Intersection Signalization	GN/L	5.00				15.00	230.00	250.00
BRIDGES								
Henderson Blvd Bridge H-2 Widening at the Deschutes River	GN/L				74.00	10.00	761.00	845.00
CITY OF TUMWATER GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$97.00	\$300.00	\$0.00	\$74.00	\$516.00	\$3,157.00	\$4,144.00

GRAND MOUND GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
CAPACITY								
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade 500' N 201st St to SR 12	L/O						9.00	9.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade 203rd to 500' N 201st St	L/O						10.00	10.00
Elderberry Rd Upgrade SR 12 to 196th Ave	L/O				10.00	24.00	133.00	167.00
Old 99 Upgrade S UGA to 203rd	L/O						10.00	10.00
Old Hwy 99 SW Bridge O-6 Replacement at Prairie Creek	GN/L/O						65.00	65.00
GRAND MOUND GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10.00	\$24.00	\$227.00	\$261.00

CITY OF YELM GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
Wilkenson Rd Upgrade Yelm City Limits to Ordway Rd	B						40.00	40.00
CITY OF YELM GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40.00	\$40.00

RURAL THURSTON COUNTY	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
Lilly Rd Upgrade 26th Ave to South Bay Rd	L	800.00						800.00
Bald Hill Rd Upgrade 4 Corners to Smith Prairie	GC/O	91.00	3,079.00					3,170.00
Skookumchuck Rd Upgrade Coal to Whitefish	GC/O	100.00	50.00	2,025.00				2,175.00

Thurston County Comprehensive Plan

Capital Facilities

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY Cont...	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
Hawks Prairie Rd Upgrade Carpenter Rd to Johnson Pt	GC/L	100.00	690.00					790.00
Reservation Rd Upgrade Burlington Northern RR to SR 510	GC/L	5.00						5.00
Bald Hill Rd Upgrade RR Crossing to Five Corners	GC/L	425.00						425.00
Zangle Rd Upgrade Boston Harbor to Elementary School	B						40.00	40.00
Carper Rd Upgrade James Rd to Old Hwy 9	B						70.00	70.00
Vail Road Upgrade 138th to Bald Hill Rd	GN/L	60.00	50.00	2,705.00				2,815.00
Delphi Road Upgrade 62nd to Mud Bay Hwy	GN/L						10.00	10.00
Rich Rd Upgrade Deschutes River to BNRR	GN/L				133.00	300.00	1,464.00	1,897.00
Vail Road Upgrade Bald Hill Rd to SR507	GN/L	50.00	100.00	150.00	700.00			1,000.00
SAFETY								
Old Hwy 99/Tilley Rd Intersection Channelization Improvements	GN/L					7.00	10.00	17.00
Old Hwy 99/183rd Ave Intersection Realignment & Channelization	GN/L				190.00			190.00
Yelm Hwy/Meridian Intersection Improvement	GN/L						45.00	45.00
Johnson Pt Rd Turn Lane At Hawks Prairie Rd	L				20.00	360.00		380.00
Morris Rd Curve Realign Curve in Vicinity of 115th Ln	GN/L	220.00	140.00					360.00
Littlerock Rd/113th Intersection Improvements	L/O				10.00	165.00		175.00
Bald Hill Rd by Owl Hill Pit Shoulder/Guardrail Improvements	GC/L	230.00						230.00
Mullen Rd Upgrade Vicinity of 46th Ave SE	GN/L						10.00	10.00
BRIDGES								
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-7 Replacement At Scatter Creek	GN/L						57.00	57.00
Hawks Prairie Rd Bridge H-1 Widening At Woodland Creek	GN/L					275.00		275.00
Littlerock Rd Bridge L-5 Replacement At Bloom's Ditch	GN/L	10.00	298.00					308.00
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-9 Replacement At Scatter Creek North of Tenino	GC/L	50.00	1,000.00	124.00				1,174.00
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-8 Replacement At Scatter Creek West of Tenino	GN/L						61.00	61.00
Independence Rd Bridge I-3 At Independence Creek South of 201st	L	7.00	10.00	450.00				467.00
OTHER								
Yelm to Tenino Trail Phase 2	GC	5.00						5.00
Independence River Bank Protection	GN/L	12.00	10.00	468.00				490.00
Rails to Trails Rainier/Tenino Fish Passage	O	5.00						5.00
Old 99/PS&P Railroad Crossing	GC	5.00						5.00
Lackamas Creek Fish Passage/Bald Hill Rd	GN/L	113.00						113.00
Case Rd Extension Fish Passage	GN/L	5.00						5.00
Waddell Cr Rd Fish Passage	GC/L	5.00	5.00	50.00				60.00
Salmon Creek Basin Critical Roads Elevation Project	GC/L	69.00	427.00					496.00
Emergency Response Projects	GN/L/O	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	450.00
Fish Passage			50.00					50.00

Thurston County Comprehensive Plan

Capital Facilities

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS								
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION	Fund Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 YR. TOTAL
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY Cont...	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
Working Reserves (to cover projects where grants are not received or come in lower than anticipated, emergencies, and unanticipated safety upgrades)	GN/L	250.00	69.00	69.00	69.00	70.00	70.00	597.00
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY TOTALS		\$2,692.00	\$6,053.00	\$6,116.00	\$1,197.00	\$1,252.00	\$1,912.00	\$19,222.00
TOTALS	100%	\$4,851.00	\$8,187.00	\$13,316.00	\$4,098.00	\$5,512.00	\$18,912.00	\$54,876.00

LEGEND:

GC - State or Federal GRANTS have been COMMITTED

GN - State or Federal GRANTS have NOT been COMMITTED

L - County road fund LOCAL match

O - OTHER developer or agency contributions

B - Proposed county BOND

REGARDING GRANT FUNDING FOR NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS: Not all grant funding for NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS during the first two years has been secured. These non-capacity projects that do not receive their grant funding during the first two-year period may have to be moved to a later year when local or grant funding becomes available.

REGARDING GRANT FUNDING FOR CAPACITY PROJECTS: There are four capacity projects in the first two years that do NOT have grant funding secured -- three in the Olympia Growth Area: (1) Mud Bay Road from Evergreen Parkway to Kaiser Road; and (2) & (3) Yelm Highway in two sections -- between Henderson and Boulevard and from Boulevard to Rich Road. (4) The Grand Mound Growth Area Old Highway 99 Bridge over Prairie Creek.

REGARDING BONDS PROPOSED TO BE ISSUED: The financing of the bond-financed projects begins in the year 2005 because this is the earliest it looks like the county has enough in the Road Fund to begin to pay debt service. This situation will be further evaluated later in the six-year period. Intent is to begin to fund via bonds some of the road safety needs that has been accumulating but never funded because they are ineligible for grants and they exceed the capacity of money available in the Road Fund.

REGARDING THE GRAND MOUND URBAN GROWTH AREA: The Transportation Element of the Capital Facilities Plan reflects the capital projects and funding strategies found in the 1997 Amended Grand Mound Subarea Plan.

REGARDING EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROJECTS: Due to past weather related and other unforeseen conditions (such as landslide repairs), emergency response projects have been part of the normal expectations.

F. County Buildings:

County government has outgrown its space in the county buildings located on Evergreen Park Drive and other locations in Olympia. For the last few years, the County has been evaluating its current and future space needs and, by the mid 1990s initiated a construction program for its first priority needs: a Jail Work Release Annex (completed in 1997), a Juvenile Detention/Family & Juvenile Court building (opened in 1998), an Emergency Services Center (opened in 1998), , a new Public Health and Social Services building (opened in 2001), a new Coroner building (opened in 2003), and a new Evaluation and Treatment (Triage) Center (opening in 2004).

In 1994 a committee of citizens and county elected officials and staff reviewed county space needs in detail. They identified first priorities and recommended Level of Service (LOS) standards for county government as noted on Table 6-2. These standards translate into square footage needs as follows: after deducting the space being provided in the new Emergency Services and Juvenile Detention /Family Court facilities:

Area:

74,214 sq. ft.	Law & Justice square feet needed (<i>without inclusion of a new satellite jail</i>)
109,287 sq. ft.	General Government square feet needed (<i>without inclusion of records storage</i>)
183,501 sq. ft.	Needed in Year 2004
121,659 sq. ft.	Space available at current courthouse site
62,142 sq. ft.	Additional space needed by year 2004

This six-year plan includes the County building related projects scheduled in this planning horizon (identified in Table 6-14). Immediate needs are being alleviated by leasing and remodeling the spaces of agencies with the most crowded conditions by removing walls and installing efficient work station spaces until these projects are complete.

Future Space Needs: Other space needs for county government, or intergovernmental facilities that the county shares, are not listed here because planning has not progressed to the point where costs and timing are yet identified. For example, not yet scheduled in this planning horizon, is a retrofit of buildings two and three at the main County Courthouse campus on Lakeridge Drive to convert them for general government space needs. The retrofit project is dependent on the completion of a Law and Justice Center that would relocate law and justice activities from the Lakeridge Drive campus to another site.

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

COUNTY BUILDINGS OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:OBJECTIVE 1-L:

County Buildings - County government buildings should be located to provide convenient access to residents being served, where appropriate public facilities and services are available or can be provided, and designed for efficient and frugal use of public monies.

POLICIES:

1. Standards for level of service must be realistic, attainable, and not excessive.
2. Level of Service standards for County Buildings should be based on:
 - a. Consideration of national, state and professional standards for the applicable space.
 - b. Applicable federal and state laws.
 - c. Cost effectiveness and consideration of the ability of the county to fund ongoing costs of operations and maintenance.
3. Efficiency in design and use should be a goal for new facility development. Building design and function must promote flexibility to accommodate a variety of uses and interior spatial changes. New facilities should be built for a 50-year life span.
4. Options to construction of new space should include such considerations as innovative use of alternative hours, telecommuting, night court, kiosks, distributed service locations, automation efficiencies, workload distribution, work at home opportunities, and drive-through service points.
5. Public-private partnerships should be examined for their potential to offset costs and improve efficiency.
6. A Capital Reserve fund should be established to provide funding for major maintenance projects.
7. Evaluation of capital costs and maintenance and operation costs should give priority to long-term energy efficiencies achieved through design and construction.
8. Charges for space in county buildings should recover full costs, including capital expenses, amortization, depreciation, and maintenance and operation cost.

**Table 6-11
THURSTON COUNTY BUILDINGS CAPITAL PROJECTS
2005 - 2010**

j:\cfp:\bldg02-07.xls

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS <i>Fund Source</i>		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005-2010 6 Yr. Total	2004 amended
Bond (1)		3,882,000						3,882,000	2,000,000
Fund Balance		979,251						979,251	
Future Bond (1)		6,250,000	18,730,000	2,900,000				27,880,000	
REET/ General Fund		2,135,804	1,965,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	11,876,824	
Roads and Transportation Services		750,000	500,000					1,250,000	1,300,000
TOTALS		13,997,055	21,195,804	4,843,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	45,868,075	3,300,000

EXPENDITURES--PROJECTS	Funding Source	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2005-2010 6Yr. Total	
Business Applications Information Systems	R, GF, CSFB	1,182,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	3,682,000	
Courthouse Complex Security Project	FB, R	229,251						229,251	
Courthouse Parking	R	100,000						100,000	
Fair Heritage Hall	FB, CSFB	700,000	800,000					1,500,000	
Glenn Hoffman Law Office	R, B	22,000	22,000	900,000				944,000	
High Speed Communication Link	R, CSFB	20,000	980,000					1,000,000	
HVAC Renovation	CSFB	1,250,000	1,250,000					2,500,000	
Information Technology	R, GF	443,804	443,804	443,804	443,804	443,804	443,804	2,662,824	
Juvenile Detention and Family Court Bldg	B	1,200,000						1,200,000	2,000,000
Leased Consolidation & Office Adjustment	B, FB, RT	2,350,000	700,000	2,000,000				5,050,000	
Roads Tilley Traffic Building	RT							-	1,300,000
Satellite Jail	B, DFB	5,000,000	15,000,000					20,000,000	
Sheriff Training Facility	RT	500,000	500,000					1,000,000	
Special Capital Projects (Major Maintenance/Repairs)	R, GF	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	6,000,000	
TOTALS		13,997,055	21,195,804	4,843,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	1,943,804	45,868,075	3,300,000

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	6 Yr Total
Current Debt	3,866,854	3,873,421	3,874,818	3,785,445	3,779,972	3,784,807	22,965,317
Future Debt	276,193	1,428,245	2,342,716	2,381,330	2,381,330	2,381,330	11,191,144
TOTALS	4,143,047	5,301,666	6,217,534	6,166,775	6,161,302	6,166,137	34,156,461

LEGEND:

B Bonds (See Note #1)

GF General Fund

CSFB Central Services Future Bond

R Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)

DFB Detention Sales Tax Future Bond (nonvoter GO bond to be financed from Sales Tax).

RT Roads and Transportation Services

FB Fund Balance

NOTE:

- (1) These are bonds paid for by outside revenue sources, either voter approved from the property tax, or councilmanic paid from revenue sources such as Detention Sales Tax, REET or other sources.
- (2) These projects would be funded, if a source for repaying bonds is found (such as a property tax approved by the voters, existing revenue sources or a combination) these projects would be funded.

Table 6-12
Thurston County Inventory of Public Facilities

[Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)]

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
PARKS								
Active Regional Parks								
Thurston County/City of Lacey Athletic Complex	SE	1999		67 AC	Under construction	Develop soccer, softball and other athletic fields, restrooms, parking, trails, picnic areas, concession stand, and other support facilities	2005-2010	\$4,600,000
Deschutes Falls	SE	1992		155 AC	Poor*	Develop trails, interpretive center, overlooks, picnic areas, caretaker facilities	2007-2009	\$2,500,000
District Parks								
Burfoot	NE	1973		60 AC	Good*	Misc-renovation of trails, bridges, restroom	2006-2007	\$100,000
Frye Cove	NW	1973		86 AC	Good*	Develop trails, picnic areas, playfields, restroom, picnic shelters, playground	2010	\$500,000
Kenneydell	SW	1988/1997 1999		18 AC 23 AC Addition	Good *	Misc repairs as needed Parking trails, picnic areas, ballfields, restroom	2007	\$300,000
Deschutes River	SW	1991		50 AC	Poor *	Develop parking areas, picnic areas, restrooms, viewpoints, trails, camping areas	2007	\$500,000

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
District Parks (Continued)								
Guerin	NW	1976		40 AC	Fair *	Develop trails, viewpoint, picnic shelters, picnic areas, playground, viewpoints /dock, parking areas	2008-2010	\$1,200,000
Griffin Athletic Fields	NW	Not acquired. Griffin School District property developed as partnership with County.		40AC	Good *	One baseball /softball and one soccer field developed in 2000. Additional fields to be developed as funds become available over the next 3 years.	2007-2009	\$600,000
Louise H. Meyers	NW	1988		38 AC	Fair *	Develop trails, picnic areas, parking & restroom facilities, playfields /ballfields.	2010	
Rainier View Park	SE	1996		54AC	Fair *	Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms.	2008	\$300,000
Ruth Prairie Park	SE	1996		35AC	Fair *	Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms, picnic shelters	2009	\$300,000
Special Use Parks								
ORV Sports Park	NW	1977		150 AC	Poor *	Misc-Funded by state grants		CLOSED
Boston Harbor Boat Ramp	NE	1980		1 AC	Good*			
Lake Lawrence Park	SE	1988		15 AC	Fair *	Develop trails, parking areas, elevated boardwalk, viewpoints, restroom.	2010	\$150,000

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Special Use Parks (Continued)								
Mima Preserve	SW	1989-90		1,020 AC	Fair *	Develop interpretive trails, interpretive center, and basic support facilities.	2010	
Woodland Creek Wetlands	NE	1987		75 AC	Fair *	Develop interpretive trails, viewpoints, parking area.	2010	
Johnson Point Wetlands	NE	1990		26 AC	Fair *	Develop interpretive trails, parking.	2010	
Black River Natural Area	SW	1991		13 AC	Fair *	Develop trails, parking, picnic sites.	2010	
Indian Road	NE	1940		5 AC	Fair *	Under consideration for disposal /trade /sale.		
Trails								
Chehalis Western	NE-SE	1991		182 AC	Good *	Pave, develop trailheads for parking & restrooms, benches, scenic overlooks.		\$700,000
Chehalis Western Trailhead	SE	1991		10 AC	Fair *	Develop parking area, restrooms, ballfields, picnic areas & shelters.	2006 - 2007	\$400,000
Chehalis Western (Vail Loop Trailhead)	SE	1996		3 AC	Fair *	Develop parking areas, picnic sites.	2010	\$250,000
Yelm-Tenino	SE-SW	1993		400 AC	Good *	Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, scenic overlooks, benches.	2007-2010	\$1,200,000

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Historic Sites								
Gate-Belmore	NW-SW	1996		243 AC	Poor*	Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, viewpoints, benches.	2010	\$2,500,000
Mima Cemetery	SW	1869		2 AC	Fair*			
Ft. Eaton Monument	SE	1982		1 AC	Fair*	Misc repairs, renovations		
STORMWATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES (legend: cf = cubic feet, lf = lineal feel, ea = each)								
Detention Pond SSWU	Steilacoom Road	1992	\$7,500	12,000 cf	Fair	None	N/A	
Fish Passage SSWU	Green Cove Creek	1996	\$70,000	200 lf	Good	None	N/A	Fish Passage SWU
Retention/ Water Quality Mountain Aire SSWU	Mountain Aire Drive	1998	\$118,300	5,333 cf Retention 2,400 gal. treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Retention/ Water Quality Tanglewilde East SSWU	Queets and Skykomish	1998	\$237,325	12,182 cf Retention 6,000 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Water Quality Forest Glen SSWU	Forest Glen Drive	1998	\$163,820	3,600 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Retention/ Water Quality Boulevard Road	Boulevard Road	1998	\$318,250	503,200cf Retention 294,700 cf treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Retention/ Water Quality Evergreen Terrace	Sitka Street	1998	\$153,000	9,146 cf Retention 2,100 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Flooding/ Water Quality Hidden Forest SSWU	Hidden Forest Drive	1999	\$728,800	6,740 cf Retention 6,740 cf treatment	Good	Modify outlet structure,	2002	\$500

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Stormwater Drainage Facilities (Continued)								
Flooding/ Water Quality Carpenter Loop Phase 1 SSWU	Carpenter Loop	1999	\$150,000	6,283 cf Retention	Good	None	N/A	
Flooding/ Water Quality Carpenter Loop Phase 2 SSWU	Carpenter Loop	2000	\$175,500	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Flooding/ Water Quality Lake Forest SSWU	Walthev Dr., Harvard Dr. Lake Forest Dr.	2000	\$201,800	9731 cf Retention 4,800 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Flooding/ Water Quality Tanglewilde South SSWU	5 th Way SE	2000	\$174,000	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Flooding / Water Quality Tanglewilde South SSWU	6 th Avenue and Bulldog Street	2001	\$237,500	20,561 cf Retention 7,200 gal treatment	Good	None	N/A	
Water Quality McAllister Treatment Upgrades	Wendy Drive SE; Planer Street SE; Northwood Drive SE; Gem Drive SE; Summerfield Avenue SE;	2001	\$222,600	1272 cf Treatment	Good	None	N/A	2001
Flooding/ Water Quality Timberlakes Location 1thru 6 SSWU	Sierra Drive SE, Mill Court SE, Timberlake Drive SE	2002	\$715,500		Good	None	N/A	
SEWER SYSTEMS								
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	\$10,700,000	1,880 - 5,560 ERU	Good	None Scheduled		
Boston Harbor	North	1990	\$3,000,000	254 ERU	Good	None Scheduled		

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
SEWER SYSTEMS (Continued)								
Tamoshan	Cooper Point	1976	\$500,000	116 ERU	Good	None scheduled		
Olympic View	NW	1977 Upgraded 1998	\$210,000	27 ERU	Good	None Scheduled	N/A	
WATER SYSTEMS								
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	\$3,500,000	2,400-4,800 ERU	Good	None Scheduled	N/A	
Boston Harbor	North	1989	\$1,500,000	300 ERU	Reservoir Good*	Replace water Reservoir	2002	\$365,000
Tamoshan	Cooper Point	1994	\$300,000	94 ERU	Good	None Scheduled	N/A	
SOLID WASTE								
Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC)	Hogum Bay Road	1948	\$20 million	Closed	New*	None - post closure monitoring	2001-2031	2004-\$100,000
Rainier Drop Box	Rainier	1960	\$300,000	5,000 tons per year	Fair*	Remodel Work – new scales & road surfacing	2004-2009	\$15,000
Rochester Drop Box	Rochester	1960	\$300,000	5,000 tons per year	Fair*	Remodel Work—new scales & road surfacing	2004-2009	\$855,000
Summit Lake Drop Box	Summit Lake	1987	\$100,000	1,000 tons per year	Good*	Remodel Work	2004 & 2007	\$1,200 ea.
Landfill Compost Center	WARC	1993	\$600,000	8,000 tons per year	Poor*	Facility repairs & upgrades	2004-2009	\$50,000
Landfill Recycle Center	WARC	1988	\$250,000	3,000 tons per year	Good*	Facility repairs	2004-2009	\$75,000
HazoHouse	WARC	1991	\$160,000	150 customers per day	Poor*	Facility repairs	2004-2009	\$850,000

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
SOLID WASTE (Continued)								
Landfill Storage Building	WARC	1988	\$50,000	500 sq. Ft.	Good*	Facility repairs	2004-2009	\$15,000
Landfill Maintenance Building	WARC	1994	\$500,000	2,700 sq. Ft.	Good*	Remodel Work-expansion	N/A-no at this time	
Landfill Scales and Toll House	WARC	1999	\$800,000	1000 sq. ft.	New*	None		
Gas Migration Control Facilities	WARC	2001	\$1,250,000	2,500 cfm	New*	None at this time		
Stormwater Facilities	WARC	1990	\$750,000	25 million gallons	Good*	Drainage correction due to settlement	2004-2009	\$59,000
Leachate Facilities	WARC	1990	\$1,000,000	3.8 mil Gal.	Excellent*	as needed	2004-2009	\$100,000
Thurston County Transfer Station	WARC	2000	\$6,775,000	600 tpd	New*	None only as needed	2004-2009	\$100,000,000
TRANSPORTATION								
Rural Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Various	Various	14.467	Various *	Various	2005-2020	\$7,578,000
Rural Major Collector	County-Wide	Various	Various	225.549	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$120,117,000
Rural Minor Collector	County-Wide	Various	Various	53.630	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$31,573,000
Rural Local Access	County-Wide	Various	Various	483.313	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$30,834,000
Urban Principal Arterial	County-Wide	Various	Various	7.308	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$4,369,000
Urban Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Various	Various	34.667	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$26,795,000
Urban Collector	County-Wide	Various	Various	17.901	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$8,535,000
Urban Local Access	County-Wide	Various	Various	184.717	Various*	Various	2005-2020	\$5,582,000
Bridges	County-Wide	Various	Various	107	Various*	Various	2005-2020	unknown
Bike Lanes--As upgrades are made to any road above local access, paved shoulders are added which provide space for pedestrian and bicycle use.								

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
COUNTY BUILDINGS								
Parks Mud Bay Shop	Mud Bay		\$136,800	1,824 sq. ft.	Good*			
Roads Tilley Complex (6)	Tilley Rd	1986	\$3,250,175	42,150 sq. ft.				
Roads Tilley Traffic Building	Tilley Rd	2004	\$1,300,000	13,730 sq. ft.	Excellent*			
Roads Boulevard Buildings	Blvd. Rd		\$4,302,662	86,428 sq. ft.	Poor*	Sell	2004	
Roads Mud Bay Equip. Bldg.	Mud Bay		\$45,623	936 sq. ft.	Poor*			
Roads Littlerock Equip. Bldg.	Littlerock		\$45,623	936 sq. ft.	Poor* (Vacant)			
Roads Rainier Equip. Bldg.	Rainier		\$102,360	2,100 sq. ft.	Fair*	Needs new roof		
Roads Rochester Equip. Bldg.	Rochester		\$102,360	2,100 sq. ft.	Fair*			
Heritage Hall	Fairgrounds		\$1,030,925	9,120 sq. ft.	Good*	Major Remodel Poor Physical condition	2005	\$800,000
Benoschek Building	Fairgrounds		\$329,400	4,392 sq. ft.	Good*	Fair physical condition		
Deck Building	Fairgrounds		\$137,728	2,560 sq. ft.	Good*			
Fir Building	Fairgrounds		\$136,006	2,528 sq. ft.	Good*			
Sharp Building	Fairgrounds		\$139,450	2,528 sq. ft.	Good*			
Craft and Hobby	Fairgrounds		\$334,421	6,216 sq. ft.	Good*			
Lake Building	Fairgrounds		\$172,160	3,200 sq. ft.	Good*			
Food Court	Fairgrounds		\$150,640	2,800 sq. ft.	Good*	Fair physical condition		

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
COUNTY BUILDINGS (Continued)								
Deschutes Grange	Fairgrounds		\$42,454	912 sq. ft	Good*	Fair physical condition		
Restroom Buildings	Fairgrounds		\$228,229	1,702 sq. ft	Good*			
Caretakers Residence	Fairgrounds		\$42,000	840 sq. ft.				
Exposition Hall	Fairgrounds		\$942,000	7,000 sq. ft.	Excellent*			
All sheds and booths	Fairgrounds		\$49,065	3,271 sq. ft.	Good*	Fair physical condition		
All Barns	Fairgrounds		\$696,000	48,600 sq. ft.	Good*	Fair physical condition		
Courthouse Bldg. 1	Olympia	1978	\$4,786,496	45,421 sq. ft.	Fair*	HVAC, ADA, MMR		
Courthouse Bldg. 2	Olympia	1978	\$4,949,940	35,914 sq. ft. Superior Ct.: 6 Ctrms.	Fair*	HVAC, ADA, MMR		
Courthouse Bldg. 3	Olympia	1978	\$12,899,284	74,471 sq. ft. Jail: 266 beds Dist. Ct.: 3 Ctrms	Good*	HVAC, ADA, MMR		
Courthouse Bldg. 4	Olympia	1987	\$1,849,432	17,622 sq. ft.	Good*			
Social Services	Lacey	Leased	\$791,750		Good*	By tenant per lease agreement		
Assigned Counsel 921 Lakeridge Way	Olympia	1987	Leased	2,897 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Heritage Court	Olympia	1992	Leased	17,850 sq. ft	Good*	N/A		
Parkmont	Olympia	1992	Leased	2,825 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Elections 2905-29th Ave SW	Tumwater	1994	Leased	3,900 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
COUNTY BUILDINGS (Continued)								
Elections 2905-29th Ave SW	Tumwater	1995	Leased	4,200 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Family Support 2404 Chandler Ct.	Olympia	1994	Leased	2,972 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
PAO Civil 2415 Evergreen Park Dr.	Olympia	1996	Leased	5,500 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Pacific Mtn. Capital Financial Center	Lacey	1994	Leased	9,294 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Records Center	Tumwater	1991	Leased	10,000 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Juvenile Justice Center	Tumwater	1998 opened	\$18,000,000	82,000 sq. ft. in 4 Ctrms.; Detention: 80 beds; Day Detention: 40-80.	New*	N/A		
Emergency Services Center	Olympia	1997	\$5,000,000	17,997 sq. ft.	New*			
Social Services	Olympia	?	\$168,050 Leased Out to tenant	House	Fair*	By Tenant per Lease Agreement		
Courthouse Jail Annex and Bathroom Facilities	Olympia	1997	\$850,000	3,752 sq. ft. (92 beds)	Fair*	None	n/a	n/a
Family Support Center	Olympia	1997	Leased	1,000 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Grays Harbor Job Training Center	Aberdeen	2000	Leased	9,219 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					CONDITION AND FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Current Condition	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
COUNTY BUILDINGS (Continued)								
Records Center Annex	Tumwater	1997	Leased	3,900 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A		
Health and Social Service Building	Olympia	2000	\$5,881,772	25,836 sq. ft.	New*	None	2001	\$5,771,772
Coroner Facility	Tumwater	2002	\$1,028,000	6,950 sq. ft.	New*	None	N/A	<u>N/A</u>
Social Services	Lacey	Vacant	\$163,600 Lease Out to Tenant	unknown	Fair *	Roof, Floor Coverings	2004	<u>\$40,000</u>
Justice Center Project 910-A Lakeridge Way	Olympia	2002	Lease	2,564 sq. ft.	New*	None	N/A	N/A
Market Square Cooperative Extension	Lacey	1999	Lease	3,766 sq. ft.	Good*	N/A	N/A	N/A

Current Condition refers to meeting Level of Service – Excellent (Exceeds LOS); Good (Meets LOS); Fair (Meets some LOS); Poor (Meets no LOS) or if () means professional judgement

VI. PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS

A. Facilities of Other Public Entities. Inclusion of public facilities of other public entities in this section is for information, only, in compliance with the Growth Management Act, which says the capital facilities element is to include summary information on "capital facilities owned by public entities." Table 6- 13 includes the major public facility improvements planned by those public entities that responded to Thurston County's request for information to include in this Comprehensive Plan.

The following public entities either declined to apprise the County of their Capital Facilities Plans or responded that they do not have any capital facilities planned for the coming six-year period:

- Fire Districts not listed in Table 6-13
- School districts not listed in Table 6-13
- Grand Mound/Rochester Park & Recreation District
- Tanglewilde Park and Recreation District
- Public Utility District
- Cemetery Districts #1 and #2
- Intercity Transit
- Other special districts not listed above

Thurston County cannot control the planning or construction of capital facilities by other public entities within its borders, such as school districts, fire districts, port districts and transit entities. However, the capital facilities planned by these other entities must, under the Growth Management Act, be part of the County's Capital Facilities Plan. Inclusion of the capital facilities planning by these other entities will promote consistent and unified capital facilities planning throughout the County. However, the inclusion of their plans does not imply County approval or disapproval of the plans or the levels of service, which they adopt. Rather, their inclusion insures compliance with the GMA and enables a consistent approach to capital facilities planning throughout the County, taking into consideration the Capital Facilities Plans of all public entities in the County. Most of the public entities referenced in table 6- 13 have adopted their own 6 and 20 year Capital Facilities Plans. For more information, please refer to those adopted Capital Facilities Plans. For goals and policies related to schools and coordinated planning with other public entities, see below.

Table 6-13
Facilities of Other Public Entities

Resolution No. 13072 (12/15/03)

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Rainier School District #307			
New Grades 4-5 Building (to be added to the K-3 facility) 20,000 square feet	Third Street, Rainier	\$2.5 million (estimate)	State Matching Funds and Local Bond Issue 2004 or 2005.
Rainier School District TOTAL		\$2.5 million (estimate)	
North Thurston School District			
Construction to preserve and maintain existing facilities	Varies	\$7,000,000	Secured Local Funds
Temporary Classrooms Purchase (5 per year) and Relocation		\$1,500,000	Secured and Unsecured Funds (Voluntary Mitigation)
Site acquisitions for future schools		\$1,200,000	Mitigation fees
North Thurston School District TOTAL		\$9,700,000	
Olympia School District			
L.P. Brown Elementary School — Add’ns/Modernization, Phase II	2000 26th Ave. N.W., Olympia	\$6,200,000	Secured local bonds, impact fees and mitigation fees
Washington Middle School Add’ns / Modernization	3100 Cain Road SE, Olympia	\$17,000,000	Secured local bonds, impact fees, and mitigation fees.
Reeves Middle School Addn’s/Modernization	2200 N. Quince St. Olympia	\$13,700,000	Secured local bonds, local bonds.

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Capital High School, Phase II Add'ns/Modernization	2707 Conger Avenue, Olympia	\$24,200,000	Secured local bonds, impact fees, and mitigation fees.
Ingersoll Stadium Improvement	1302 North St. SE, Olympia	\$2,200,000	Secured local bonds
Pioneer Elementary School New Classroom Wing and Improvements, Phase IV	1655 Carlyon Ave. SE, Olympia	\$6,800,000	Secured local bonds, impact and mitigation fees.
Various small works projects (incl. asbestos abatement, facility improvements, playfield improvements)	Various school sites	9,500,000	Secured local bonds
Olympia School District TOTAL		\$ 79,600,000	
Tumwater School District #33 (2003-2009 CFP)			
Site Acquisition & Development	Various sites	\$ 2,500,000	Mitigation fees and secured local funds
Portables	Various sites	\$ 2,350,000	Secured local funds-mitigation fees
District Office Addition		\$ 4,000,000	Local bond funds and state match
Blacklake Elem. Remodel	6435 Black Lake Belmore Rd SW	\$5, 134,707	Local bond funds and state match
M.T. Simmons Elem. Remodel	1205 S 2 nd Street	\$6, 514,447	Local bond funds and state match
Linderson/Dennis St. Upgrade		\$ 347,707	Local bond funds and state match

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
P.G. Schmidt Elem. Remodel	6600 Capitol Blvd.	\$ 4,763,272	Local bond funds and state match
Littlerock Elem. Remodel	12710 Littlerock Rd SW	\$3, 414,964	Local bond funds and state match
Tumwater M.S. Remodel	6335 Littlerock Rd SW	\$5, 288,917	Local bond funds and state match
Stadium Classroom Remodel		\$ 885,913	Local bond funds and state match
Stadium Athletic Upgrade		\$1,800,000	Local bond funds
BHHS Gym and Fieldhouse		\$2,200,000	Local bond funds
THS Vocational Ed. Facility Upgrade		\$200,000	Local bond funds
Elementary No. 7 Site Development		\$3,300,000	Local bond funds
Other technology and infrastructure projects		\$11,148,493	Local bond funds
Tumwater School District Total		\$53,848,420	
Yelm Community Schools District #2 (in Thurston County)			
Yelm High School Addition and Modernization (2006)	1315 Yelm Ave. West	\$29,386,622	Secured local funds and unsecured state match funds
Construct New Junior High School	SR 507	\$19,662,266	Secured local funds and unsecured state match funds
Addition to Prairie Elementary School (2006)	16535 110th Ave SE	\$409,868	Secured local funds
Lacamas Elementary School (2006)		\$2,376,100	Secured local funds

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Addition to Fort Stevens Elementary School (2006)	16525 100th Way SE	\$428,220	Secured local funds
Construct Yelm Education Center		\$2,500,000	Secured local funds
Misc. Capital Projects		\$3,601,660	Secured local funds
Yelm Community Schools TOTALS		\$58,364,736	
Fire District #1			
Construct new fire station	187 th and Sargent Road	\$950,000	Secured local bonds
Fire District #3			
Construct new vehicle repair facility	Station 34, 8407 Steilacoom Road SE	\$1,000,000	City of Lacey and District Funds
Remodel station #34	8407 Steilacoom Road SE	\$150,000	City of Lacey and District funds
Construct new substation facility	6600 blk of Mullen Road SE	\$1,300,000	City of Lacey and District funds
Fire District #3 TOTAL		\$2,450,000	
Fire District #4			
Construct new headquarters	133 rd Ave, Rainier	\$600,000	Grant
Fire District #9			
Replace fire stations #91, 95		\$ 2,500,000	Unsecured funds
Remodel and enlarge station #9	Cooper Point Road at 66 th Ave NW	\$250,000	Unsecured local bond funds
Fire District #9 Total		\$ 2,750,000	
Fire District #11			
Rebuild/relocate Station # 11-3	3131 Maytown Rd SW	\$750,000	Unsecured local bond funds

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Rebuild/enlarge Station #11-4	2640 Trevue Ave SW	\$750,000	Unsecured local bond funds
Fire District #11 Total		\$1,500,000	
Port of Olympia (Olympia Airport only)			
Runway Safety Project- Roads and Localizer	Tumwater UGA	5,500,935	Federal grant funding (90%) and local funds

B. Public purpose lands and essential public facilities.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that comprehensive plans address both lands for public purposes and siting essential public facilities. The GMA states that the county:

- Shall identify lands useful for public purposes;
- Will work with the state and cities within its borders to identify areas of shared need for public facilities;
- Shall prepare with other jurisdictions a prioritized list of lands necessary for the identified public uses;
- Include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities; and
- No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude siting essential public facilities in their jurisdiction.

Confusion often arises as to the distinction between lands for public purposes and essential public facilities. Essential public facilities can be thought of as a subset of public purpose lands. The following table illustrates the distinctions.

Table 6-14

Distinguishing Public Purpose Lands From Essential Public Facilities

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS	ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES
FOCUS: Lands needed to accommodate public facilities.	FOCUS: Facilities needed to provide public services and functions that are typically difficult to site.
Lands needed to provide the full range of services to the public provided by government, substantially funded by government, contracted for by government, or provided by private entities subject to public service obligations.	Those public facilities that are usually unwanted by neighborhoods have unusual site requirements or other features that complicate the siting process.
Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility Corridors¹ • Transportation Corridors² • Sewage Treatment Facilities • Stormwater Management Facilities • Recreation • Schools • Other Public Uses <i>Note: See Chapter 2, Land Use, for an</i>	Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale Transportation Facilities • State Educational Facilities • State and Local Correctional Facilities • Solid Waste Handling Facilities • Airports • Inpatient Facilities Such As: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substance Abuse Facilities

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS	ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES
<i>inventory map of public purpose lands.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mental Health Facilities ➤ Group Homes ➤ Secure Community Transition Facilities

1. Addressed in the Utilities Chapter.

2. Addressed in the Transportation Chapter.

C. Coordinated Public Purpose Lands:

The GMA calls for coordination among the cities, the State and the County, to identify and prioritize lands needed for public facilities. This provides the opportunity to also identify areas of shared need, and possibly, shared use or other efficiencies. The County is currently coordinating public facility needs (including land needs) with the cities and towns through the joint planning process. Additional coordination and prioritization should be pursued through a regional consultation process. A partial list of shared needs identified to date is presented in Table 6-15.

Table 6-15

Interjurisdictional Shared Needs for Public Purpose Lands

Projects Serving Shared Needs	Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts				
	Thurston County	Cities or Towns	School Districts	Port of Olympia	State
Pacific Avenue Wetland (Stormwater retentions/ parks/school facility)	WWM-Stormwater	Lacey Parks	North Thurston		
Green Cove Creek Basin Project- Land Acquisition	WWM-Stormwater	City of Olympia			
Salmon Creek Basin Plan-Elevating Roadways	WWM-Stormwater	City of Tumwater			
HazoHouse Repairs and Upgrades	WWM-Solid Waste				Ecology
Chehalis Western Trail (coordinated recreation use/ stormwater retention/utility corridor)	Parks	Lacey Parks and Public Works, Olympia Parks and Public Works			Fish and Wildlife
Yelm – Tenino Trail (coordinated recreation use/ stormwater retention/utility corridor/highway access/ potential future rail use)	Parks	Yelm Parks and Public Works, Rainier Parks and Public Works, Tenino Parks and Public Works			Transportation
Gate to Belmore Trail (coordinated recreation use/ potential future rail use)	Parks	Tumwater Parks		Rail Transit (future)	Parks

Projects Serving Shared Needs	Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts				
	Thurston County	Cities or Towns	School Districts	Port of Olympia	State
Thurston County/Lacey Athletic Complex (coordinated development)	Parks	Lacey Parks			Transportation
Griffin Athletic Fields	Parks		Griffin		
Park Acquisitions	Parks	Lacey Parks, Olympia Parks			
Lake Lawrence Park (coordinated recreation use)	Parks				Fish and Wildlife, Natural Resources

D. Siting Essential Public Facilities:

The County-Wide Planning Policies for Thurston County provide the following requirements for siting essential public facilities (refer to Appendix C for a description of County-Wide Planning Policies):

Each city and town will:

- Cooperatively establish a process for identifying and siting county and state-wide public capital facilities having a potential impact beyond jurisdictional boundaries;
- Include public involvement at early stages; and
- Base siting decisions on the jurisdiction's adopted plans, zoning and environmental regulations, particularly as they affect critical areas, resource lands, and transportation facilities.

The Thurston Regional Planning Council provided the Interjurisdictional forum for developing the required process for identifying and siting essential public facilities. A process endorsed by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in January 1994 is included in the Special Use Chapter of the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance and below:

DESIGNATION OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES

Essential public facilities are public facilities and privately owned or operated facilities serving a public purpose that are typically difficult to site. They include:

1. State education facilities; state or regional transportation facilities; prisons, jails and other correctional facilities; solid waste handling facilities;

airports; and inpatient facilities such as group homes, mental health facilities and substance abuse facilities; sewage treatment facilities; and communication towers and antennas.

2. Facilities identified by the State Office of Financial Management as essential public facilities, consistent with RCW 36.70A.200; and
3. Facilities identified as essential public facilities in the county's zoning ordinance.

SITING ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES

Essential public facilities may be allowed as permitted or conditional special uses in the zoning ordinance. Essential public facilities identified as special uses in the applicable zoning district shall be subject, at a minimum, to the following requirements.

1. Classify essential public facilities as follows:
 - a. Type One: Multi-county facilities. These are major facilities serving or potentially affecting more than one county. These facilities include, but are not limited to, regional transportation facilities, such as regional airports; state correction facilities; and state educational facilities.
 - b. Type Two: These are local or inter-local facilities serving or potentially affecting residents or property in more than one jurisdiction. They could include, but are not limited to, county jails, county landfills, community colleges, sewage treatment facilities, communication towers, and inpatient facilities (e.g., substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group homes). [NOTE: Such facilities which would not have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located would be Type Three facilities.]
 - c. Type Three: These are facilities serving or potentially affecting only the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located.

In order to enable the county to determine the project's classification, the applicant shall identify the approximate area within which the proposed project could potentially have adverse impacts, such as increased traffic, public safety risks, noise, glare, emissions, or other environmental impacts.

2. Provide early notification and involvement of affected citizens and jurisdictions as follows:
 - a. Type One and Two facilities. At least 90 days before submitting an application for a Type One or Type Two essential public facility, the prospective applicant shall notify the affected public and jurisdictions of the general type and nature of the proposal, identify sites under consideration for accommodating the proposed facility, and identify opportunities to comment on the proposal.

Applications for specific projects shall not be considered complete in the absence of proof of a published notice regarding the proposed project in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area. This notice shall include the information described above and shall be published at least 90 days prior to the submission of the application.

The Thurston Regional Planning Council may provide the project sponsor and affected jurisdiction(s) with their comments or recommendations regarding alternative project locations during this 90-day period.

(The purpose of this provision is to enable potentially affected jurisdictions and the public to collectively review and comment on alternative sites for major facilities before the project sponsor has made their siting decision.)

- b. Type Three facilities. Type Three essential public facilities are subject to the county's standard notification requirements for special uses.
3. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable significant adverse impact on critical areas or resource lands, except for lineal facilities, such as highways, where no feasible alternative exists (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(a)).
4. Major public facilities which generate substantial traffic should be sited near major transportation corridors (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(b)).
5. Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following:
 - a. An evaluation of the sites' capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services;
 - b. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;
 - c. The sites' relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger; and
 - d. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites that meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also identify proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts.
 - e. The applicant shall also briefly describe the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.

6. The proposed project shall comply with all applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, and other county regulations.
7. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS SECTION:

GOAL 2: EVERY CITIZEN SHOULD HAVE SAFE AND CONVENIENT ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 2-A: *Schools* - Mechanisms and procedures should be established and maintained to ensure that new school facilities are coordinated with growth and their impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

POLICIES:

1. All development proposals should consider enrollment impacts on schools.
2. Where the size of a single proposed development warrants, the developer should identify at the first stage of project review proposed school sites meeting school district standards such as topography, acreage requirements, location, and soil quality. Such sites should be dedicated for school use under terms negotiated by the developer and the school district.
3. Schools should be sited to consider transportation and health needs as follows:
 - a. Where practical, schools should be located along non-arterial roads in order to minimize potential conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Where the school district finds that siting on arterials is the most practical, school development should include frontage and off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
 - b. Availability of sewer and water facilities should also be considered in siting schools, as well as location in areas not subject to exposure from hazardous/dangerous materials, poor air quality or safety hazards.
4. School siting and expansion should avoid prime agricultural land.
5. The County should notify affected school districts of new subdivision proposals, and new schools should be reviewed by the county through a site plan review zoning process where impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

OBJECTIVE 2-B: *Shared Facility Use with Schools*-The county, school districts, and other governmental agencies should coordinate the use of facilities and operation of programs in order to use facilities efficiently and avoid duplication of public expenditures.

POLICIES:

1. Shared use of school facilities by the general public should be encouraged.
2. The county and the school district should cooperate in the planning and utilization of school and recreational facilities.

GOAL 3: TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE, WELL-LOCATED PUBLIC LANDS AND FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 3-A: Identify, in advance of development, appropriately sited lands needed for public purposes, including essential public facilities.

POLICIES:

1. The County should obtain or secure (e.g., by obtaining a right of first refusal for desired property) sites needed for County public facilities as early as possible in the development of an area, to ensure that the facilities are well located to serve the area and to minimize acquisition costs.
2. The County should support regional coordination efforts in identifying shared needs for lands for public purposes to maximize the efficient use of public capital resources.
3. The County should ensure that its development regulations do not preclude the siting of essential public facilities, subject to reasonable development standards and mitigation measures, within Thurston County.
4. The County should identify and site essential public facilities in accordance with the County-wide Planning Policies.

Staff Note: We do this at the long range planning level.